

MILITARY CHAPLAINS'  
REVIEW

1983







# **Military Chaplains' Review**

**“Reflections on the Chaplaincy”**

**DA Pam 165-139**

**Fall, 1983**

**Volume 12, No. 4**



# Military Chaplains' Review

**“Reflections on the Chaplaincy”**

**DA Pam 165-139**

**Fall, 1983**

**Volume 12, No. 4**





## Preface

The *Military Chaplains' Review* is designed as a medium in which those interested in the military chaplaincy can share with chaplains the product of their experience and research. We welcome articles which are directly concerned with supporting and strengthening chaplains professionally. Preference will be given to those articles having lasting value as reference material.

The *Military Chaplains' Review* is published quarterly. The opinions reflected in each article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the view of the Chief of Chaplains or the Department of the Army. When used in this publication, the terms "he," "him," and "his" are intended to include both the masculine and feminine genders; any exceptions to this will be so noted.

Articles should be submitted in duplicate, double spaced, to the Editor, *Military Chaplains' Review*, United States Army Chaplain Board, Myer Hall, Bldg. 1207, Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703. Articles should be approximately 8 to 18 pages in length and, when appropriate, should be carefully footnoted. Detailed editorial guidelines are available from the editor on request.

## Chief of Chaplains

Chaplain (MG) Patrick J. Hessian

## Editor

Chaplain (LTC) Richard N. Donovan

## Former Editors

Chaplain (LTC) Rodger R. Venzke, October 1976—July 1981

Chaplain (LTC) Joseph E. Galle III, July 1974—September 1976

Chaplain (LTC) John J. Hoogland, May 1971—June 1974

---

The *Military Chaplains' Review* (ISSN 0360-9693) is published quarterly for free distribution to authorized persons by the U.S. Army Chaplain Board, Myer Hall, Building 1207, Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703. Second-class postage paid at Red Bank, NJ 07701 and additional mailing offices.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Military Chaplains' Review*, U.S. Army Chaplain Board, Myer Hall, Building 1207, Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703.



# Introduction to the “Fort Leonard Wood Papers”

**Chaplain (COL) James G. Thompson**

The Chaplains at Fort Leonard Wood have concluded a very significant Chaplains' Denominational Identity Workshop. We are pleased to share our concepts in the *Military Chaplains' Review* as the first several articles of this issue.

The seed idea for this workshop was planted more than a year ago by Chaplain (LTC) Phillip J. Cassibry, CPE Supervisor and Phase III Trainer. In his work with first-tour Chaplains he determined that we needed to stress denominational identity and relationships. The concept of a workshop grew from that, and the Office of the Chief of Chaplains agreed to support the idea with a “Models Program” grant.

More significantly, Chaplain (MG) Patrick J. Hessian, the Army Chief of Chaplains, demonstrated his personal interest by agreeing to provide the keynote address. He stayed with us through the entire workshop, indicating clearly by his presence his high regard for chaplains and the issues we were discussing.

Participants in the workshop provided a rich mixture of backgrounds and perspectives. These included senior Army Chaplains, Endorsing Agents and official church representatives, local chaplains from Fort Leonard Wood, and a military officer who happens also to be a dedicated churchman. They represented a dozen different denominations and ranged in rank from Captain to Major General. However, in spite of our diverse backgrounds, we found many common concerns weaving their way through the presentations.

Following the first-day presentations, participants met with Major General C. J. Fiala, the Commanding General of Fort Leonard Wood. General Fiala, an active Roman Catholic Lay Eucharistic Minister, shared informally his views on the chaplaincy as a vital force in the military services. It was a special privilege to hear from a man who has the perspective of many years of service both to the Army and to the Church.

I am sure that this workshop will be of continuing significance, particularly in the lives of the younger chaplains who attended. I highly commend to you this workshop model, and would like to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation to all those who made the workshop possible.



Chaplain Thompson is a clergyman of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ). He has served ten years with Combat Arms units, ten years with hospitals and health care units, and is currently serving as the Post Chaplain at Fort Leonard Wood. He is a Fellow of the College of Chaplains and a Certified Clinical Chaplain of the American Protestant Hospital Association.

# Military Chaplains' Review

Articles	Page
Introduction to the "Fort Leonard Wood Papers"	
Chaplain (COL) James G. Thompson .....	1
An Historical Review of the Army Chaplaincy: Free Exercise	
Chaplain (MG) Patrick J. Hessian .....	5
The Call to Ministry	
Chaplain (COL) Dorsey E. Levell .....	11
A Response	
The Reverend Lemuel D. McElyea .....	16
The Chaplain and His Denominational Relationship	
The Reverend Pat H. Davis, Sr. ....	18
A Response	
Chaplain (CPT) William B. Daylong .....	23
The Chaplain as a Denominational Representative in the Military	
The Reverend Bertram C. Gilbert .....	25
A Response	
The Reverend Leroy A. Bevan .....	30
The Chaplain's Allegiance to His Church	
Chaplain (COL) Billy W. Libby .....	32
A Response	
The Reverend James P. Rickards .....	37
The Chaplain's Allegiance to the Military	
Chaplain (COL) John P. Ettershank .....	41
A Response	
Chaplain (MAJ) Roger D. Wight .....	48
The Chaplain as an Advocate of Religious Freedom	
Chaplain (MAJ) Jerry E. Malone .....	51

Articles	Page
A Response	
Colonel Peter J. Kane .....	<b>59</b>
The Roman Catholic Chaplain in the Third Christian Epoch	
Chaplain (COL) Robert J. Ennis .....	<b>62</b>
A Response	
Chaplain (LTC) Cecil D. Lewis .....	<b>68</b>
<hr/>	
Serpents, Doves and Swords:	
The Wise Man as a Model for Ministry in the Military Chaplaincy	
Chaplain (CPT) Fred L. Downing .....	<b>72</b>
The Chaplain: Prophet, Jester, or Jerk	
The Reverend Thomas A. Harris .....	<b>80</b>
I Am the Chaplaincy	
Chaplain (LTC) Robert L. Gushwa .....	<b>89</b>
Book Reviews .....	<b>93</b>

### **Themes being considered for future issues:**

---

Transitions in congregations  
Religious education  
Family Life  
Preaching  
Storytelling

Persons interested in contributing an article on one of the themes listed above should coordinate early with the editor to insure that their contributions fits well with other articles planned for the issue.

The *Military Chaplain's Review* also prints an occasional "non-thematic" issue. Any subject having to do with chaplain ministry is appropriate for such issues.

# An Historical Review of the Army Chaplaincy: Free Exercise

**Chaplain (MG) Patrick J. Hessian**

When he planned the education of his son, Richard, Oliver Cromwell observed, "I would have him learn a little history." There is much to be said for this point of view. As many astute observers of human nature have remarked, an individual is wise to have a clear vision of what his forefathers did in order to thoroughly understand how he came to be where he is today. Knowing and appreciating where we are today, in turn, helps us decide where we ought to strive to go tomorrow. A famous former Chief of Chaplains, Charlie Brown, once said, "He who is without a sense of history is like the jackass. He doesn't know his ancestry and he isn't capable of producing progeny."

I propose to review a bit of our history today. I would like each of you to be conversant with it so that none of you will be uncertain or defenseless before those who question your presence in the military. I also want you to be insightful about our purposes and our role in the history of this great country. Since you will shape the future of the Chaplaincy branch, you need to know both the shame and the pride of our past and how you came to have the responsibilities you presently have. Our history will also help shape your vision of the future.

## Our Roots

The roots of the US Army Chaplaincy lie in the Hebrew Bible and the British military. Deuteronomy 20:2-4 speaks of "the priest anointed for war," whose function was to bring spiritual comfort for those who jeopardized their lives in combat. The first recorded job description for English



Chaplain (Major General) Patrick J. Hessian is a Roman Catholic priest, ordained in 1953 in Minnesota. He joined the US Army Reserve in 1958, and entered active duty in 1963. Among other assignments, he served as Brigade Chaplain for the 173rd Airborne Brigade in Vietnam, the Staff Chaplain for the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault) and Fort Campbell, the Corps and Post Chaplain of the XVIII Airborne Corps and Fort Bragg, and the USAREUR and 7th Army Chaplain in Europe. He is a graduate of Command and General Staff College and the US Army War College. He currently serves as Chief of Chaplains, Department of the Army.

chaplains, written in the 1680's, emphasized both their spiritual role and its ecumencial spirit: "The preacher, be he priest or minister... (has the) ...duty... to have 'care of souls,' and it is well if he meddle with no other business, but make that his only care." These early concepts, of spiritual comfort and "the care of souls," defined the role of chaplains in the American Army. The thread that held the Chaplaincy together since the Chaplaincy concept was first introduced into the secular military was that the chaplain was the staff officer who provided for the free exercise of religion of all military personnel in the command. This rationale was not expressly stated. Indeed, in our early years, it expressed itself only rarely in the behavior of some of our better, religiously motivated chaplains.

## **Lexington and Concord**

The story of the US Army Chaplaincy began on 19 April 1775 at Lexington Green and Concord Bridge. Four New England clergy were present for the opening shots of the revolution. Three of the four shouldered their muskets and fought side by side with the soldiers as well as ministering to them. The fourth, William Emerson, was the first clergyman to serve solely in the capacity of a chaplain. He ministered to the Revolutionary soldiers until he died on active duty.

Like the three first chaplains, some other early chaplains lacked a clear concept of their function. In hindsight we could describe their work as a mingling of holy and profane. We admire them for their spirituality. We question their overzealousness.

These chaplains were not unique. Two hundred and eighteen chaplains served during the Revolution. Many were overzealous. There were colonial clergymen who raised military units from their own congregations and often led them into battle. One of the Civil War chaplains stood and fought with the Union forces and was surprised when the notorious 17 year old Jesse James shot him down.

## **The Civil War**

Carrying and using weapons was not the only problem of misguided chaplains. During the Civil War, we had more than our share of unfit chaplains. President Lincoln said that we were the worst bunch in the Army. Some chaplains sold supplies to soldiers, stole horses, falsified records and were known for their drunkenness and cowardly actions.

These chaplains did not understand the Chaplaincy role. They made a mockery of the name chaplain. It took the dedication, courage, sacrifice and death of other more noble chaplains to restore our good name. Chaplains, like William Hoge, ran the Union Blockade to bring Bibles from England to Southern soldiers of all denominations. Chaplain Corby gave last rites to the dying under a hail of fire and gave General Absolution to the Irish Brigade minutes before 506 of those soldiers lay dead on the field at Gettysburg. Chaplain McCabe refused escape during

the retreat from Winchester and remained with the wounded. Later as a POW, he maintained the morale of all the prisoners in Libby Prison. Chaplain Overton, called the "coolest and most gallant man in battle," prayed with the wounded of every denomination under withering fire.

And there were, of course, other gallants in our own time: Frank Sampson, who stood bravely with the prisoners in Germany, and Emil Kapaun, who was the tower of strength in the Korean War Prison, and there were others. Charlie Watters and Angelo Liteky, as you know, received the Congressional Medal of Honor in Vietnam.

## **Our Duty**

What is our duty as chaplains? A review of the history of the Chaplaincy shows that it was an evolving and generally unarticulated concept. In the beginning, as we noted, some chaplains felt that it was their duty to fight beside their parishioners. Others felt that they should inspire their congregations to greater heights of patriotism and greater acts of heroism in battle. Still others conducted themselves in a manner that was singularly spiritual, ministering to the souls of the soldiers. Some chaplains restricted their ministry to their own denominations. Others served people of every faith. There was, in short, no clear, single, early concept of the chaplain's role.

As a result, it is not surprising that commanders misused chaplains. Chaplains were given all kinds of duties. Between the World Wars, for example, chaplains served as club managers, PX officers, morale officers, librarians, recreation officers, athletic officers, education officers, postal officers, counsels for the defense at court martials, as well as mess and burial officers.

## **Forging Our Role**

However, there were many military chaplains who helped to shape the development of the present, more spiritual, free exercise role of the Chaplaincy. Working daily and intimately with soldiers and understanding their needs, they initiated and furthered helpful programs that were frequently later formalized, integrated into the Armed Forces and continued by others.

The thread that runs through the activities of these better military chaplains is concern for the entire unit. Protests of military chaplains, for example, shaped the sentiments which precipitated the abolishment of the punishment of flogging by the Navy in 1850. During the Civil War, Major General U.S. Grant turned to Army Chaplain John Eaton of the Union Army to organize the care and employment of a large number of Blacks who had joined the Army. In 1872, chaplain opposition resulted in the end of the daily issue of grog aboard Navy vessels. Reviewing their contributions during World War I, General of the Army John J. Pershing wrote: "Their usefulness in the maintenance of morale, through religious counsel

and example, has now become a matter of history."

The Army Chaplaincy has been sensitive to race relations. On the eve of the Pearl Harbor attack, although there were only five Black officers in the entire Army, three of them were Army chaplains. Today, there are about 110 Black Army chaplains from 24 different denominations. This represents about 8% of the Army Chaplaincy.

The multi-sectarian activities of the military chaplains did not go unnoticed. General Eisenhower, wrote that "a good chaplain in the Army is worth more than his weight in gold." In 1946, the House Military Affairs Committee of the U.S. Congress publicly commended chaplains for their work in retaining a high standard of morality. General Douglas MacArthur used chaplains in the Far East to combat problems of morale, home-sickness, grumblings, and complaints among his occupation forces. He wrote: "We must...exert strong and direct moral leadership over the members of the occupying forces, to the end that the underlying moral fiber remain undiminished in strength. Such moral leadership devolves, in large measure, upon the corps of chaplains working in close understanding and cooperation with all unit commanders...."

In the late 1960's and early 1970's, to cite other examples of activities of Army chaplains, racial unrest became a major challenge confronting the Army. Army chaplains were instrumental in developing programs, activities and policies to address these serious problems. Chaplain Benjamin E. Smith, for instance, developed the Human Relations Program for US Forces in Vietnam.

Similarly, during the same period, the Army began to experience significant difficulties among soldiers in the areas of drug and alcohol abuse. Once again, the Army turned to its chaplains who spearheaded a wide variety of programs in the war against drug abuse. Military chaplains became integral parts of the "healing teams" at Drug Treatment Facilities. In fact, it was an Army chaplain who suggested the policy, adopted by the Army, of amnesty for drug and alcohol offenders.

Another example during the early 1970's was the development of leadership skills which were weakened during the Vietnam war. Because military chaplains possessed extensive counseling and human relations skills, they were called upon by the Army to develop and present personal effectiveness training on an experimental basis to mid-level supervisors. Subsequently, much of this training was adopted by the Army and non-chaplain personnel were trained as instructors.

## A Gift of Life

Army Chaplains were also with their fellow soldiers on the battlefield. Eleven gave their lives during the Revolutionary War, 91 during the Civil War, 11 during World War I, 77 during World War II, 11 in Korea and 13 in Vietnam. Over 2600 Army chaplains received decorations and awards during World War I and World War II, and over 500 received decorations

and awards during the Korean hostilities. Five chaplains received this nation's highest award, the Medal of Honor.

Four World War II chaplains have become a symbol of this ministry. The four, representing major faith groups, gave their life-jackets to troops who had none on the torpedoed transport Dorchester, and were seen standing arm in arm on deck praying as their ship sank.

The statistics of Army chaplain losses in Vietnam, America's last and longest war, also reflects this variety. Seven were Protestant, four were Roman Catholic and two were Jewish. "Their skins were white, black and brown. They came from places as distant as Israel and the Philippines. . . . Yet there was a unity in their devotion, a commonness in their sacrifice, and a oneness in their purpose-- to minister to the American soldiers wherever he was called."

## Free Exercise Rights

When I became Army Chief of Chaplains in July 1982, I announced that the Army Chaplaincy would be leading the initiative in defending every soldier's religious free exercise rights and that we as chaplains would remind commanders of their responsibilities in this area. Chaplain (COL) Israel Drazin articulated and emphasized the free exercise concept and standards in 1981. I am pleased with the action we have taken and in the results. The published policy of my office is being well received. We were involved in about a hundred free exercise matters during the past year. I intend to continue to pursue this policy with vigor.

Two hundred and eight years ago, those first four American chaplains who participated in the Revolution, probably did not fully understand the potential existing in the Chaplaincy role. But the concept and understanding of free exercise has grown since that time. For the past two years, after its introduction by the Army Chaplaincy, the Chaplaincies of all three services have openly articulated free exercise as the *raison d'etre* of the military Chaplaincy.

Today, just as we understand that it is not the chaplains' role to carry weapons, so we understand that we are staff officers with a free exercise role. We care for the denominational needs of soldiers of our faith and their families. We also make daily affirmative efforts, within our units and adjacent areas that have no chaplains, to assure that no soldier's obligatory free exercise rights are infringed upon except where there is a compelling military need. And, when there is a non-obligatory religious practice involved, we help the Army use every reasonable effort to help the soldier fulfill the practice. We work with the soldier and with his or her commander to help them understand that free exercise is too fundamental and too important to allow it to be quashed with phantom fears or vague concerns such as military necessity.

Free exercise is natural to our American spirit. It is the lofty principle for which many of our ancestors gave their lives. It is an honor-

able task for which we chaplains can dedicate our time. I encourage you to dedicate yourselves to free exercise and build upon what we in DACH are doing about it. There is no greater secular or spiritual service that a military chaplain can perform for those who trust in his or her judgment than to protect their religious rights. This is the lesson of our history, and it is the mandate of the future.

# The Call to Ministry

**Chaplain (COL) Dorsey E. Levell**

The call to *the* ministry is a subject that calls up mystical feelings and old preacher jokes. We should also note that our task today involves *the* call to *the* ministry. Paul was called to *the* ministry on the road to Damascus when he was struck blind, and he was called to *a* ministry with “Come on over to Macedonia.”

We can all describe our own call to the ministry which will probably be mystical and subjective. Dr. Wayne E. Oates states in *The Ministers Own Mental Health*, that the call is subjective but tends to grow out of a deeply religious nurturing family, a concerned church as the local family of God, and/or a very special event such a fox hole experience or “...my heart was strangely warmed” by Charles Wesley at Aldersgate.

## A Biblical Perspective

The call to the ministry is characterized by key words and phrases that have meaning in specific time and events, such as: the call, called, set apart, appointed, God chosen from among men, confirmed, laying on of hands, and even the term volunteer. Most of these words I have drawn from specific biblical events.

Biblical exegesis was very difficult in writing this paper because the call to ministry is so bound up with the ministry and polity of the church that I feared becoming involved in a controversy.

However, in broad generalities, we could say that the call in the Old Testament is described as a direct intervention of God in the event. The call is characterized by audible language, anointment, and calling out. A Jewish chaplain could set me straight here because my own tradition limits knowledge and resources.



Chaplain Levell is a United Methodist clergyman who serves as the Executive Director of the Springfield, Missouri Area Council of Churches. He also serves as US Army Reserve Chaplain, currently assigned as Command Chaplain of the 102d ARCOM. Chaplain Levell has served congregations as pastor, and has served as Project Director for a number of prison and relief ministries.

The New Testament call to ministry is first the direct personal solicitation of Jesus of Nazareth, "Come follow me." The apostles, or called ones, were living witnesses to the work and ministries of whom most of us today would call "Our Lord." Paul was one who proclaimed himself to be an apostle; he was an eye witness and was called directly by Christ himself.

## An Historical Perspective

In the early church was a period of growth and struggle in defining The Call to The Ministry or the office within the church. Here again we get caught up in the jargon of deacons, elders, priests and bishops which are still points of contention as related to power.

During the period of persecution the highest calling seems to have been one of martyr and monk, he who "gives up" for the sake of Christ and his church. Dr. Richard Niebuhr's book *The Ministry in Historical Perspectives* (which I used as a refresher to write this paper), quotes from John Chrysostom (345-407 A.D.) in describing the functions of a priest as sacraments, discipline, and instruction. These themes continue in the literature of the church down to the present. By the way, Chrysostom states that "a priest must be sober, cleared sighted, and possess a thousand eyes in every direction. . . ."

During the middle ages the highest calling moved from martyr and monk to priest and knight with major emphasis upon sacraments. The Reformation Period brought a renewed emphasis upon preaching, right teaching, and right administration of the sacrament. The church divided over the authority of The Book and The Church. Teaching became the corner stone of ministry in the post reformation period.

When the church moved to the new world, which was characterized by diversity, adaptability and innovation, it took on these attributes. Discipline became a problem on the frontier because personal judgment and preaching became the corner stone of trained and untrained ministers.

You may be thinking that I am digressing or avoiding the issue by talking about the Role rather than the Call. However, it is difficult to separate the vision, that is the visual image in the mind of the one being called, from the Call itself.

## The Call Defined

I found these definitions of the Call: John Calvin is quoted by Niebuhr, "...that secret call, of which every minister is conscious to himself before God, but which is not known to the church. This secret call, however, is the most honest testimony of our heart that we accept the office offered to us, not from ambition or avarice, or any other unlawful motive, but from a sincere fear of God, and an ardent zeal for the edification of the church." He goes on to describe the confirmation of the call: "when those who

appear suitable persons are appointed with the consent and approbation of the people...to guard the multitude from falling into any improprieties through inconstancy, intrigue, or confusion." He is pointing to the personal experience of being confirmed by the election of the church.

John Milton describes "the inward calling of God that makes a minister." Dr. Wayne Oates of our own generation in *Pastoral Psychology* states, "The call to the ministry is not a matter of fact; it is a theological interpretation of a complex constellation of processes and experiences in the life of a person."

Thus it is almost impossible to separate "The Call" when God (to use Karl Barth terminology) comes crashing into our history from the anguished cry of a 35 year old burned-out pastor who cries, "Make it plain Lord." It appears to me that we will never be able to separate the person from the function.

## **Called to the Military**

Now to the task of defining The Call to the military chaplaincy. Wouldn't it be wonderful if we could envision God plucking the finest of his finest from among the churches to be sent to be his apostles (called directly by Christ himself) in the military establishment (or better to the family of God on military installations)?

If we here today were honestly to describe our "Call to the Military Chaplaincy" many would have to describe the call as an escape from the local church rather than a call to the chaplaincy. The three year requirement for parish experience put most of us into the five-year crisis of "who am I in the midst of this?" So an opening into the military may have been for many, an escape from an impending identity crisis. Our first assignment was "for better or for worse" and for most it was both better and worse. However, the regimentation and discipline and pastoral supervision of firm and compassionate post chaplains allowed us to make some order out of what appeared to be chaos and to get on with the tasks of our calling.

I do not want to imply here that the military is an escape hatch for troubled clergy, but rather that it is a challenging (and well-paid) position for our most creative clergy to find meaning in the mystical call to be God's person in a particular place and time. The military chaplaincy/ministry has variety but also affirms for most of us the underlying unity of God's church among the churches.

## **Various Gifts**

"What is our calling?" brings us back to our role and functions. Our functions still fall under the heading of preaching, teaching, sacraments and administration (or management). Our years of education have more or less prepared us for the first three and most of us learn management as "on

the job training." It is my personal feeling that most chaplains who leave or must leave the military before promotion to LTC have not learned the skills of management of their own lives and environment. What causes many of us the most problems in our ministry is not preaching, teaching or the sacraments, but management (or administration as it is listed among of the gifts of the Spirit).

The calling within the military has variety and it appears to me has certain emphases during certain periods. During my past 20 years I have seen various gifts emphasized.

When I came into the military the senior chaplains were World War II and Korean veterans. The emphasis was upon being with the soldier where he was, either in the field or bar. The role was one of character guidance and advocacy. The chaplain guided and pulled strings to "make it right."

The pastoral psychology movement inspired many of us to see our role as counselors in the field and especially in the hospital. My own background led me from an identity crisis into four quarters of Clinical Pastoral Education in 1965.

Then came an emphasis upon the chaplain as pastor with a renewed emphasis upon preaching, teaching, and the sacraments. In my opinion this greatly strengthened the chaplaincy and rebuilt direct ties with the denominations as personified by local churches outside the installations. It also led many more specific denominations, such as Episcopal, Lutheran, and Mormons, to hold services on posts around the world as opposed to our having just one general protestant service.

## The Ministry of Laity

A few years ago, we made a turn toward lay involvement in post chapel ministries which brought into focus the church's old tension over authority between the ministry and laity.

It seems to me that the cutting edge of our calling is equipping the laity for ministry in the world, including the possible world of horrible mass casualty battlefields of the future. The ministries of the people of God in a place is one of a ministry to an individual at one point in time.

The ministry of the laity or the concept of every person being a minister is wonderful and timely, but it also brings into focus the creative tension of *the* calling versus *a* calling and the whole high calling of holy orders and the problem of authority. The military has been somewhat isolated from the power of the denominational executive (superintendents and bishops) and the layman who votes with his feet and the collection plate.

However, the calling today still hinges around the four roles of preaching, teaching, sacraments and management or administration. Each tradition may arrange these in a different rank or priority, but the situation and the soldier often calls us to serve in all four roles at once.

In summary we still have the call of God in His own way to persons for Holy Orders. I would use the term *the* call. There is *a* call to a new military post or to perform a specific task. But amidst it all there is *the* call to ministries extended to all believers wherever they are. This expanded role of ministry allows all of God's people to share the load and to "get on with it." However it changes the role of the "called one" to the one who calls, teaches, confirms and authenticates the ministries of the family of God.

Winston Churchill is reported to have said something like this: "...There seems to be a time in every person's life where he is called upon to make his particular and unique contribution to the process of mankind. A great tragedy would be if the person were unwilling or unprepared."

## **The Call to Ministry: A Response**

**The Reverend Lemuel D. McElyea**

For prophets, apostles, clergy persons and others who claim the call to ministry—we in the military chaplaincy, or those who formerly served in that capacity, feel a certain kinship. Paul the Apostle traced his peculiar effectiveness to the Damascus Road experience, Isaiah to his experience in the temple, and others in other certain unique circumstances, so each of us today must have felt some kind of a call to ministry. It may not have been something so dramatic as that of the Apostle Paul or the Prophet Isaiah. It may or may not have been a mystical experience, but may well have been a response to a felt need or challenge.

Dorsey Levell struggled with the issue of what constitutes a call to ministry. He emphasized, and I think rightly, the subjective quality of the call to ministry. To underscore this thought, each example which he used was different and each person involved interpreted the facts and circumstances of his/her call subjectively. What might seem to one person as a divine call might appear nonsensical to another who looks at the facts differently. There appears to be no valid way which a call to ministry can be tested except to consider a person's response to a particular ministry and how the institution of which he/she is a part gives or withholds its stamp of approval to that ministry. Normally, a call to ministry is "validated" following years of academic, professional and religious preparation. Responses to that ministry, either favorable or unfavorable, may seem to constitute a validation of a call to ministry or even a negation of one's claim to such a call. There seems to be an underlying assumption that if God calls a person (subjective), then there will be a recognition or validation by the community of believers (objective).

Dorsey Levell quoted Dr. Wayne E. Oates as stating that the "...call is subjective but tends to grow out of a deeply religious nurturing



Chaplain McElyea currently serves as Director of Chaplaincy Services. Assemblies of God. He served as a US Air Force Chaplain until his retirement in 1980. He has served as President of the Military Chaplains Association, Texoma Chapter. His last assignment on active duty was as Center Chaplain, Sheppard Technical Training Center, Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas.

family, a concerned church as the local family of God, and/or a very special event such as a fox hole experience....” I like that definition. However, the concept of God’s direct call such as Old Testament examples in an audible voice, cannot and should not be ruled out (i.e., Samuel’s Call).

Is there a distinction, or should there be, between the call to ministry of an individual and general calls to service and commitment by the laity? It is my belief that they are different because they serve different purposes. The clergy preach, teach, baptize, administer the sacraments (ordinances) of the church and carry out administrative duties. They are set apart exclusively for the work of God. On the other hand, the laity is called to bear witness to this call through the ordinary, secular, common life of the people and to demonstrate their faith as a community of God in a world which has not yet recognized God as supreme or as Lord. I agree with Dorsey’s statement”...that the cutting edge of our calling is equipping the laity for ministry in the world....” Some would have difficulty with this and may see their role as one who administers the sacraments. There is validity in all of these precepts.

In summary, I seem to come down on the side of John Calvin’s definition of the call as “...that secret call, of which every minister is conscious to himself before God, but which is not known to the church.” The confirming or validating element is: “...when those who appear suitable persons are appointed with the consent and approbation of the people...to guard the multitude from falling into any improprieties through inconstancy, intrigue, or confusion.”

## **The Chaplain and His Denominational Relationship**

**The Reverend Pat H. Davis, Sr.**

From an historical perspective, relationship between the military chaplain and his denomination is a relatively new concept. While clergymen served as volunteer chaplains during the development of American Colonies and into the American Revolution, denominational relationship did not take place until congressional action forced it to do so. The problem was one of ministerial standards. Screening devices, even when observed, were virtually useless. The dilemma was, "how could the Army get rid of presently enrolled misfits and prevent future acceptance of incompetent ministers?" On 17 July 1862 Congress approved legislation it hoped would provide the solution. The act stated that "no individual was to be commissioned a chaplain who is not a regularly ordained minister of some religious denomination and who must present testimonials of his present good standing, with recommendations for his appointment as an Army chaplain from some authorized ecclesiastical body or from not less than five accredited ministers belonging to the same religious denomination." The legislators were convinced that the requirement for approval from ecclesiastical authorities assured the military of obtaining qualified chaplains of good character; it also gave the denomination control over who served as chaplains. In this legislation lies the origin of ecclesiastical endorsing agencies.

### **Pastors in Uniform**

There exists in many local churches and denominations the concept that chaplains "have left the ministry;" however, it is encouraging to know that



Pat Davis serves as the Director, Military Chaplaincy for the Home Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. A veteran of World War II, he served in the US Army Reserves from 1946 until he entered active duty as a chaplain in 1956. He served in this capacity until joining the Home Mission Board staff in 1975.

this negative philosophy is slowly being overcome and that chaplaincy is becoming recognized as a viable and respectable ministry where a clergyman can serve with integrity and dignity and without violation of conscience. Several factors, I believe, helped in overcoming this stigma. World War II, in my opinion, was a major factor. An unprecedented number of troops were suddenly brought into military service through a universal conscription program commonly known as the "Draft." These were home-town boys who were to be involved in a war that would take them to distant shores and wage war on foreign soil. The citizens of America rallied around the righteous cause of this war as they had never done before. Churches of America became strong supporters of this vast war effort. There seemed to be little or no resistance from any segment of society. With this kind of personal involvement from all citizens in America it is only natural that military troops were considered as heroes and given recognition unparalleled in American history. Into this new fabric of war-time life was woven the thread of concern for the moral and spiritual welfare of the troops. Therefore, as the military increased in strength, so did the Chaplains branch. Clergymen, exempt from the awesome but respected power of the draft, either volunteered on their own or at the encouragement of church and denominational leaders. After all, these were "our sons and daughters" who were serving a cause that would free the world of tyranny and defend American soil from invasion of enemy forces. They rightfully deserved the ministry of the church and synagogue. This ministry was made possible by civilian clergymen, endorsed by their denominations, who filled the Chaplains branch as "pastors in uniform" for the duration of the war. Chaplaincy gained a new respect never before achieved. Even though this high level of respect deteriorated as the war ended, nevertheless, denominations built upon this unprecedented extension of chaplaincy ministry to further strengthen their commitment to military chaplaincy as well as foster a growing contingency of civilian chaplaincy including hospital, correctional and other institutions.

## Servants of Our Churches

In this connection the pastoral role of the chaplain is unique and should be closely identified with his denomination. It is hoped that each chaplain would envision himself as an extension of his denomination selected by that body to provide ministry to personnel within an ecumencial environment—a ministry not otherwise available to him or to any other civilian clergymen of his faith group. More specifically, some chaplains see themselves as the embodiment of their church, present in the military to provide sacraments and ministry to personnel of their own faith. This is the norm for Catholic priests and Jewish rabbis and, to some extent, a limited number of other faith groups. The end result is that the majority of denominational faith groups are cast into the "general protestant" mold. This is a matter of concern to some chaplains who find it most difficult to

make that transition. It is not unusual that situations develop through which the chaplain struggles for personal, as well as denominational, identity. It is in this struggle that each chaplain must come to grips with his call to ministry and denominational identity. He knows himself to be anointed of God, ordained by his church, nurtured and trained through his denomination. The "Blessing" of his denomination was placed upon him when it endorsed him to serve as a chaplain.

It is the endorsement, as decreed by the Department of Defense, that makes it possible for him to serve in this capacity. Therefore, it is a reasonable expectation that chaplains maintain a sense of obligation and responsibility to their denomination. The "Blessing" of his denomination was placed upon him when it endorsed him to serve as a chaplain.

It is the endorsement, as decreed by the Department of Defense, that makes it possible for him to serve in this capacity. Therefore, it is a reasonable expectation that chaplains maintain a sense of obligation and responsibility to their denomination. While the majority of chaplains respond positively to this requirement there are the few exceptions who feel otherwise and gradually neglect denominational relationships. Perhaps this grows out of the feeling that the military commissioned him, provides a career in full-time ministry, pays his salary, looks after the welfare of his family, and offers retirement and other life-long benefits. It is not difficult to understand how this might occur.

## Serving the Military

From the moment a chaplain enters the military he discovers that it is essential that he adapt to the customs of military life. The long established grade structure and the promotion system demands full attention to matters that influence efficiency ratings, the key to promotion and retention. The chaplain, therefore, faces inevitable pressures that tend to influence his attitude regarding the question, "What are my responsibilities to my denomination and to the military?" Each chaplain experiences this dichotomy to some degree. For some the stress is greater than they can manage. At that end of the spectrum are those who resign their commission and return to civilian ministry. At the other end of the spectrum are those who remain in the military but depart, not in name but in practice and spirit, from their denomination.

Existing between these two extremes are the majority of chaplains, who discover that they can serve equally both military and denomination without separating themselves from either. Their mental and spiritual maturity, their commitment to ministry coupled with their own sense of call to serve as a denominational representative within the military environment helps them maintain a healthy attitude and a growing appreciation for both.

Chaplains are in a unique position to serve both their denomination from which they came and the military establishment in which they serve.

Denominations expect their chaplains to give full attention to duty assignments and military commitments. In return, the military expects chaplains to engage in denominational matters and is liberal in providing them time and, on occasions, funds to do so. This is the manner in which the military encourages its chaplains to retain denominational ties and to develop on-going relationships. The chaplain who fails to take advantage of this is doing an injustice to his denomination, to the military and to his own professional development and growth.

## Maintaining Our Ties

Opportunities to develop denominational ties and relationships may have to be initiated by the chaplain. Time management and priority development will enable a chaplain to seek ways and to schedule his time so that he can involve himself in denominational matters.

In our denomination, we encourage our chaplains to transfer their church membership to a local church near the military installations where they are assigned, if feasible to do so. Being a part of a local church should be as important to a military chaplain as it is to other individuals. It can be vital to the chaplain and his family in their spiritual pilgrimage and personal growth.

Our chaplains are further encouraged to participate in what we call "World Mission Conferences," conducted throughout our Convention on a continuous basis and in five year cycles. The purposes of these conferences is to inform our people of the various mission programs sponsored by our denomination and supported by the local churches through the cooperative program. Through this program chaplains are given the opportunity to share with local congregations something of their ministry within the military environment and how the denomination ties into that ministry through the Chaplains Division of the Home Mission Board. It is a new revelation to most church members and pastors when they discover the meaning and the purpose of denominational endorsement. They gain a deeper appreciation for chaplaincy ministry when they learn how their church is involved in that ministry. Needless to say, everyone benefits, the denomination, the military establishment and the chaplain himself. The military considers this good public relations.

Chaplains who maintain an awareness of new programs developed and implemented within their denomination might find those programs usable and beneficial within the military. On the other hand, chaplains could assist their denomination by sharing with them new and innovative programs developed within the military that might be tailored and effectively utilized within the denomination.

## Sharing Our Ministries

Chaplains are in a position to reach out to their denominations and to share with them their expertise, skills and gifts which have been gained

through years of experience. This could contribute immeasurably to denominational relationship and would be beneficial to the chaplain, the denomination and to the military establishment.

In keeping with the basic reason for denominational endorsement, not only must the denomination accept certain responsibilities for the chaplains it endorses, but also must realize that it has certain obligations to its chaplains. The denomination cannot afford the luxury of permitting its clergymen to enter the military environment without regard to their ministry and without making available to them continuing opportunities for professional development. The denomination can find ways to share some of its resources in assisting chaplains in their personal development and spiritual growth. There are numerous ways this can be accomplished. Denominational orientation for the chaplain and his spouse will provide first-hand information regarding available various support systems and will enable them to gain a lasting appreciation for his denomination. Most young clergymen have only a vague concept of denominational structure, and few know the channels through which to call on their denomination for needed resources. Orientation gives them an insight to these matters not otherwise available. This is being done by several denominations and is meeting with measurable success.

To enhance the chaplain in his professional development, the denomination could provide annual seminars, training conferences and retreats. If the denomination wants to see its chaplains succeed in their military careers and in providing ministry to military personnel, it must recognize the need for their professional development on a continuing basis.

As we proceed through the remainder of this century we will continue to see unlimited opportunities for chaplains to carry the gospel beyond the doors of the church into the market place. This can best be accomplished by building upon a close and cooperative relationship and by maintaining strong ties between the chaplain and his denomination.

# The Chaplain and His Denominational Relationship:

## A Response

**Chaplain (CPT) William B. Daylong**

Chaplain Davis has given us an interesting glimpse of some of the historical factors that have worked to make the chaplain's relationship with her denomination such a crucial element in her ministry in the military setting. Clearly, the military services need competent, emotionally mature, spiritually sensitive pastors serving as chaplains. Hence, the perceived need for the denomination to exercise some sort of "screening" function.

### A Continuing Nurture

Beyond this, it seems to this respondent that the relationship between the chaplain and his denomination requires—in fact, deserves—continuous nurture for a much more fundamental theological reason. This has to do with the nature of the call to ministry. While it must be granted that differences in interpretation of this issue continue to exist among the various denominations (in fact, *within* this writer's own denomination, the American Baptist Churches, U.S.A.), there is significant agreement that God calls people of faith to ministry, and the community of faith confirms, nurtures, and gives sanction to this calling. Whatever the military services may legitimately require of us as chaplains, and whatever they might give us in the way of benefits and power, the call to ministry, and therefore the authority to minister, it is not something that the Army, or the Navy, or the Air Force can give us.

Small wonder, then, that there exists a lingering doubt in the minds of many more intimately related with the local church of the continued



Chaplain Daylong is an American Baptist clergyman. A native of Nebraska, he was endorsed for the military chaplaincy and commissioned in 1980. In that same year, he completed the Chaplain Officer Basic Course. He served the 84th Training Division of the US Army Reserves until entering active duty in 1982. He currently serves as Assistant Brigade Chaplain, 2nd Training Brigade, at Fort Leonardwood, Missouri.

sense of calling of those chaplains who gradually allow themselves to be isolated from their denomination or faith community. Like it or not, God has entrusted the responsibility for ministry to the community of faith, *not* to self-appointed individuals. This, then, requires a mutual accountability for the maintenance of ministry through prayer, discipline, and service. Where this mutual accountability is not accepted and practiced in a spirit of humility, many people whom God loves are to losers.

## Practical Considerations

There are some practical factors that also, at least from this commentator's viewpoint, give much incentive for us to nurture our relationship with the church in its various denominational expressions. This is especially true for those of us who otherwise come to be lumped together, in military settings, under the category of "general Protestant." Each of us, having been nurtured in a particular denominational identity, needs for our own sake and that of our families to re-affirm that particular identity that so much contributes to our understanding of who we are and what we bring to ministry. We need a positive sense of that stream of faith history in which we stand. Ecumenical ministry is much richer when this identity is nurtured. The chaplains' family is especially dependent on this affirmation.

In conclusion, then, Chaplain Davis has rightly stated that:

As we proceed through the remainder of this century, we will continue to see unlimited opportunities for chaplains to carry the gospel beyond the doors of the church into the market place. This can best be accomplished by building upon a close and cooperative relationship and by maintaining strong ties between the chaplain and his denomination.

The chaplain has a calling that requires him to share responsibility for the maintenance of ministry. Regular, open dialogue between chaplain and denomination, mutual accountability and consistent prayer support will strengthen ministry at a crucial time for the church and for the world. The church and the military services have a right to demand chaplains who draw from the roots of their faith tradition to support a ministry that appropriately exercises a wholistic ministry in its prophetic, priestly, pastoral, and administrative dimensions for the glory of God and the good of God's people. Chaplains rightly demand a denominational faith group that supports them in prayer and enters with them into a responsible partner for the betterment of ministry.

# The Chaplain as a Denominational Representative in the Military

The Reverend Bertram C. Gilbert

## The Uncommon Denominator

(Denominate: To give a name)

First, let me congratulate Chaplain Thompson for the conception and planning of this forum. Because of the importance of the subject, it is in one sense long overdue. On the other hand, it is perfectly timed to instruct both the churches and the military institutions just when the military chaplaincy is under attack both in the courts and in various denominational assemblies. Apart from the subject matter, the fact that you are willing to listen to some endorsing members of the National Conference on Ministry To The Armed Forces is evidence that the integrity of chaplains as ministers of their religious groups is a reality.

## Two Viewpoints

Let me get into my subject by suggesting that there are two polar ways of looking at ministry in the military. They relate rather neatly to the two facets you have assigned to me. The first is to propose, as I often do when defending against the fiery darts of those who dislike the chaplaincy, that:

*There is no such thing as a military chaplaincy if by that you mean an ecclesial establishment for guiding and directing the way people worship God or their ministers spread the word about Him.* There is only an administrative and support system meant to insure that such worship and ministry can go on wherever American Soldiers, Sailors and Airmen are assigned.

Chaplain Gilbert is a clergyman of the Lutheran Church in America, currently serving as Assistant Executive Director of the Division of Service to Military Personnel of the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. He served as Navy Chaplain at the end of World War II. After serving civilian parishes for several years, he joined the Army National Guard, and was called to active duty during the Korean War. He served in a variety of assignments, including combat tours in Korea and Vietnam. He served as President of the US Army Chaplain Board, which publishes the *Military Chaplains' Review*, at the time that the *Military Chaplains' Review* was established. He is the current chairman of the National Conference on Ministry to the Armed Forces.



The other view says just the opposite, which is that:

*There surely is a military chaplaincy which sets goals, designs programs, develops techniques, forms parishes and has a hierarchy which doesn't hesitate to assume pastoral oversight of clergy persons in the military.*

I leave it to you to judge which of these conceptions is most defensible constitutionally and which is more nearly the actuality, but I suggest that practically the best posture is somewhere in the middle. On the one hand the ecclesiastical bodies which endorse chaplains should object to systems which intimidate or seek to require conformity to governmental definitions of what constitutes acceptable religious practice. (Many of the religious bodies have recently been in a battle with the Internal Revenue Service on just that issue). They should be insisting that what their churches believe and do is really represented in the military.

On the other side of the question, the military situation will not enable the forces to support or find acceptable a simple representation of multidenominational particularity. The military society is not identical with the civilian but has characteristics which are more integrating, goals which are less diverse and limitations of numbers, situations and geographical dispersion. These factors cause precise specification of religious practice to be less helpful than some generalization based on common needs.

What I mean by that long complicated passage is that being a soldier in the Army is like living in an 19th century company town where everyone lives in the same sort of quarters and buys from the same store. When they are not living there, they are off to places where they are lucky that any minister of any faith group would follow in their train.

## Finding the Center

My horrible examples of the two poles are: (1) The Protestant Chaplain who holds a so-called Communion Service unpreceded by any rite or scripture which might signify specific meaning, where the people may have wine or grape juice, wafers or bread, standing or kneeling at the Chancel rail or seated in the pews and (2) the first day of the battle of Manassas when preachers of all kinds went out from Washington and Alexandria to vie with one another like side-show barkers for the attention of the soldiers to their particular brands of religion on the way to the battle.

The chaplain ministry must be somewhere in the middle, reaching out to both sides, but not in an "all things to all people and nothing to anyone" manner. Rather they should be God's ministers and their church's ministers who delight in and see to the nurture of the many flowers, fruits, vegetables, and even what look suspiciously like weeds in God's garden of faith. In doing that nurturing, part of the work will be with military members of the chaplain's faith group. That is what we call the maintenance portion. Sent by their denominations to minister to its members, this can be a large or a minuscule part of the calling depending on the size of the

particular body. It is obvious that the Roman Catholics have it made in this regard, but some of the rest of us croak pretty loudly in the pond too. Sometimes, however, when Lutheran Chaplains croak too loudly, claiming that they are primarily to serve Lutherans, I tell them to count the total number of troops, cut it to those who claim any affiliation, cut it to those who will admit they are Lutherans and then cut that to those who are paying any attention to their faith.

## Faithful Ties

Still that remnant, including those who have been only nominal in their memberships, are important and are often the group which gives the greatest sense of satisfaction to the chaplain. Time after time chaplains report, "If it were not for my denominational fellowship, I don't know how I'd survive."

Besides that, if a Southern Baptist or an LDS or an Episcopalian Chaplain can't be expected to do this sort of special handling job, something is wrong with the job description.

That job description should say something like:

1. To signal their particularity to those of their faith group without turning off the others. This takes some deftness, intentionality and perhaps even some good humored slyness.

I had an LDS Chaplain's Assistant one time who played the field organ as we gathered the troops for services. When I noticed that soldiers would often go over to talk to him after service I asked him about it. "Oh, he said, I always play some LDS music and they know what I am." The problem here is the chaplain who thinks that sending a signal means holding a service meant for all non-Catholics as though they were at St. Johns in Corn Kernal, Iowa or the church of the Holy Proselytizer in Albany, Georgia. It is just not fair.

2. To provide satisfying denominational worship, social and educational opportunities where this is possible. This is enriching and is a complementary part of the whole program.

The nastiest problem here is the senior chaplain who calls divisive anything having a specific denominational label or even a form differing from his own style. As an endorsing agent of a group which encourages its chaplains to do specific denominational work, I can tell you some sad tales of short-sighted seniors.

Of course at Red River Depot or that little post on the Black Sea in Turkey it may *be* divisive to hold a denominational gathering, but on most large posts the larger the variety of offerings the greater the participation in the total religious effort.

3. The chaplains should strengthen the connection of soldiers with their faith group using literature, personal contacts, referrals to near-by churches and above all by being positive about their faith group.

When I make an endorsing-agent-visit to a post I always ask for a

gathering of lay persons of our denomination. Frankly, I don't think I should have to ask. It seems to me that my chaplain and the post chaplain should be gathering those folks so they can get a booster shot of good news from the home church.

4. Chaplains should in their own lives in deportment reflect the standards of the group which sent them, as role models for the members of their churches and others. I don't want to cast stones, so you may fill in your own examples. In a sense it is true that chaplains ought to be more conservative in this matter than their civilian counterparts, just because there are more opportunities to give offense. Ordination and endorsement to the chaplaincy is not to a solo ministerial flight on a hang glider but to a crew of galley slaves of the Lord where the successful voyage depends on all of them.

## A Broader Role

Now to the larger part of the ministry of a chaplain. Except for Roman Catholics, Jews and some others, the main work will be in serving people of other faith groups. The principles nevertheless apply to all.

Because the chaplaincy has many of the characteristics of missionary work, there is a temptation for a chaplain and his denomination to think of this as a great field ripe unto harvesting to their own particular silos. Service to others then becomes a matter of winning them to a so-called better way.

There was a time when the general Protestant offering was so careful about being non-denominational that it repelled by its blandness. Today more and more Chapel programs including some Religious Education programs and the men and women of the Chapel have become far less bland but so weighted by one end of the denominational spectrum that those on the other end are staying away in droves. Some of these programs are captive to non-church groups which insinuate that there is something heretical about the institutional church. Sometimes the leaders of these groups make life for a chaplain of a different persuasion a trial of faith. Again the job description must be wrong. A reach is called for to that definition of the chaplaincy which says that it is a support means for all kinds and varieties of belief and practice.

## Formula for Chaplaincy

Here is my formula which I think every endorsing agent should have in mind when he or she goes talen scouting for chaplains.

1. Chaplains should have the small "c" catholicity which enables them to believe that there are, for now, many wholesome varieties of religious experience and that they should all be blessed with their help and encouragement.

2. Chaplains should have the humility to know that they cannot serve all people as well as some others might. They should, of course, try their best

to be their minister but should call on others to help as needed.

In this regard chaplains should realize that the people in age groups with which they deal are, for the most part, temporarily uprooted from their religious soil. Transplanting them in a different soil may not always be the best gardening.

3. Chaplains should plan their programs so that they provide a wide variety of offerings. Instead of calling non-Catholic services General Protestant, they should call them Ecumencial services or simply Chapel Services and clearly indicate the denomination of the presiding chaplain. We should consider the use of terms denoting services which gather people who seek to worship in similar ways. So, for example, evangelistic services; services for those of the Reformed tradition; Pentecostal services; just as we have used the term "Gospel Services" successfully.

4. Chaplains should know enough about the faith groups of America that they can take the essentials from many of them, recast them in ways which delight and, in many a program-offering, produce a unity which may not be possible in any other part of our society.

In this regard, remember that a common denominator of a large group of differing numbers is never a small number. The common denominator of 1-2-3-4-5 and 6 is 60 and when you invite in mystic 7 there is no common denominator short of infinity.

So the chaplain is always an uncommon denominator, but one who has that uncommon kind of wisdom and grace which will with tender loving care point all the sheep:

Black and White  
The grey—the brown  
Coarse haired and fine  
and even those which look a bit like goats  
to that maker and namer of them all.

5. The faith groups which endorse chaplains should understand that what ministry to the military has been, is now, and will become is exactly what those faith groups have made it by lending their ministers to it. Chaplains are *their* representatives, the endorsers are the friendly responsible consultants and the whole fabric is a weaving of many threads of the Glory of God. To paraphrase a poem about America which fits the chaplaincy too:

We made it and we make it  
And it's ours  
We will defend it  
It shall be sustained.

# **The Chaplain as a Denominational Representative in the Military: A Response**

**The Reverend Leroy A. Bevan**

From the perspective of an evangelical denomination with a brief 75-year history and fewer than 50 years of support for active duty military chaplains, there may be a bit of paranoia among our clergy persons. The minuscule number of our members prohibits our endorsed chaplains from any hint of kingdom-building. They may not entertain the idea of sheep-stealing, which their colleagues who are observing very carefully frown upon. It may sometimes appear to them that the Roman Catholic priests and clergy persons from the mainline Protestant denominations have it made.

Chaplain Gilbert's proposition of "*an ecclesiastical establishment*," albeit a tempting approach, has no reality for us. Secondly, the chaplaincy model for ministry which includes goal setting, designs, programs, developmental techniques, and managerial skills may appear to be the answer for the "long haul," but may exceed the clergy person's skills, patience, or both. The temptation is to project a third alternative of ministry which is familiar, has a fast track, and gets immediate results; namely, "*a minority mentality*." Everyone else has "*bowed their knee to Baal*," but we will bind together for a spiritual survival and maintain our brand of religious uniqueness for uniqueness' sake.

In addition to Chaplain Gilbert's "*four-step job description for ministry*" and his "*four-step formula for the ecumencial approach*," it seems appropriate to introduce an additional set of dynamics which may influence the effectiveness of one's ministry.

## **The Family of Faith**

Once again, from a denominational base the majority of our clergy person's spiritual formation takes place in a "family-type" parish setting, as the size of many of our congregations are numerically small. Higher

Leroy A Bevan is a clergyman of the Church of the Nazarene, and served for 30 years as a U.S. Navy Chaplain. He received many awards, and was personally commended by Rear Admiral Ross H. Trower, Chief of Navy Chaplains. He retired from the Navy with the rank of Captain, and has been serving as Chaplaincy Coordinator, International Headquarters of the Church of the Nazarene since 1982.

education for the clergy person usually takes place in a liberal arts college with a student body consisting of 1200-1800 persons. Seminary training takes place in a single institution. This denominational chaplain is keenly aware of a "family-type" support system. He/ she relates to the ministry of need and possesses a firm denominational identity, a caring awareness, a steady commitment, and a can-do resourcesfulness. Such motivation is a healthy basis for a projection of a balanced nurturing program within the spectrum of his own faith group. Additionally he/she is expected to marshall all of their potential and energies, under God, to create an atmosphere for extended ministry that will contain positive elements of outreach toward a spiritual growth system in behalf of every person for whom he/she is responsible.

# The Chaplain's Allegiance to His Church

Chaplain (COL) Billy W. Libby

In the beginning I want to suggest three frames of reference as the Chaplain carries out ministry in the Armed Forces.

1. The Chaplain speaks from a tradition of religious, ethical, and philosophical thought and practice. For those of us currently serving in the Army, that is primarily the Judeo-Christian tradition, which assumes then some commonality of thought and understanding. For those of us who call ourselves Christians, there is an assumption of commonality of literature and historical experience. We share a responsibility to the integrity of that tradition.

2. The Chaplain speaks from a particular or specific tradition—that is, the body which set him aside for ministry. In my case I am ordained in the United Methodist Church, a specific branch or expression of the wider Christian community. Like all other clergy, I am responsible to the particular discipline and polity of the denomination in whose name I minister.

3. The Chaplain speaks from within the Army where he serves by permission of both the religious body and the military as the arm of the State. At all times we are responsible to the duly constituted authority of the Army whether in the form of regulations or specific verbal orders.

I think these are important because without them the Chaplaincy cannot be understood. Hutcheson in his book *The Churches and The Chaplaincy* spoke of this institutional duality as a key point (p. 7). I think that observation still relevant; our situation as Chaplain vis a vis the two institutions has not been altered appreciably.

## The Primary Referent

From that introduction, I want to suggest that the Chaplain must under-



Chaplain Libby is a United Methodist clergyman. He served as the 1st Brigade and DIVARTY Chaplain of the 101st Airborne Division in Vietnam in 1967-1968. He has also served as the 3rd Infantry Division Chaplain in Europe. He was assigned to the US Army Chaplain Board 1972-1975, and returned to the Board in 1982 to serve as its President.

stand the religious tradition as the primary frame of reference in matters of faith and morals. McArthur's magnificent Farewell Address at West Point reminds me of the cadet song that ends "and the Corps, and the Corps, and the Corps...." Since hearing and reading those words in my first year of active duty, I have changed the words slightly to reinforce my own self understanding. I suggest to you that for the Christian chaplain there might be a song that ends "...And the Church, and the Church, and the Church," though recognizing that individually we might interpret that institution in various forms.

The Army, too, has recognized this relationship. FM 16-5 (8 July 77) says:

Chaplains serve in the Army as clergy of their particular religious faith. The Chaplain's spiritual authority to teach and preach, to conduct religious services, to perform ecclesiastical rites, and to administer the sacraments and ordinances of the Church or religious body are imparted to them through their ordination or certification. The ritual and rules of their own religious tradition are consequently their guide in these matters. (p. 1-1)

Similarly AR 165-20 (15 Oct 79) states:

A chaplain represents his denomination in the Army and complies with the spiritual and administrative requirements of his church.... His service as a Chaplain depends on the endorsement of his religious organization. (Para 1-3e, p. 1—1)

The Army thus reinforces my own self-understanding. I am an ordained clergyman, set aside by my specific denominational body for certain functions, and responsible to that body. While serving in the Army I agree that my service is in the name of that denomination within parameters agreed upon by both institutions.

## Role Tensions

Under normal circumstances, this arrangement engenders no more tension for the military Chaplain than those experienced by fellow clergy in other institutions to include denominational congregations. Regardless of location of service, there are issues such as power, authority, and matters of conscience that must be settled at some agreeable level. In day to day operations I believe these are *generally* interpersonal issues that can easily be worked out.

Periodically however, there will arise issues related to our role function which are much broader. These generally are organizational policies or procedures which, when acted out by organizational representatives, raise the level of tension for the Chaplain sensitive to the dual

institutional role. How, then should we act?

For me, the answer is a process of questions. What is my self-understanding as a clergyman? What are the issues involved? What is the tradition of the Church? What are directives, policies, or guidelines of my own denomination for its clergy? In the absence of such, what is the response of my own conscientious thinking as tested in discussion with other members of the community of faith? What are possible courses of action appropriate to the circumstances? What are the perceived consequences to each of those persons primarily affected? Now that process may seem rather involved. But I suggest that usually the response is obvious; there is only one right way to respond. For instance, a particular program emphasis of my denomination may clearly be inappropriate in the pluralistic military environment, and must be laid aside in the interest of cooperation with the wider group of chaplains. On the other hand, there may be other situations in which the right choice is less obvious, requiring agonizing prayer and appraisal.

An example would be organizational policies that seem to be racially discriminatory. Hopefully, no Chaplain in 1983 would support such policies and would do everything possible to bring about a change. For example during the Viet Nam era, an installation Chaplain protested a Chief of Staff's verbal directive that Black Chaplains would not deliver next of kin death notification to Caucasian families. The Chaplain's threat to involve his denomination, and to resign if necessary, brought about a change in policy.

A less clear situation currently revolves around the status of women in the Armed Forces. Though most of our denominations and the military are committed to equal opportunity as an outgrowth of ethical thinking, the possibility does exist that there are still legitimate national interests that override the use of women soldiers in all situations. Equal opportunity in this sense is not a matter of faith or morals, nor is there an absolute guarantee legally. I think it important however, that the Chaplain be willing to risk asking hard questions of the organizations and its leaders as decisions are made regarding the role of women, to include confronting behavior and thinking that indicates a lack of ethical understanding or a sense of integrity.

## A Personal Story

It is probable that for most of us a major conflict of conscience, that is, one that shakes the roots of our being, will come about no more than once during our service as Chaplains. For me that was the nature of our involvement in Viet Nam. For purposes of illustrating the above mentioned analytical process, I will retell some of that story.

While serving in Europe 1962-1967, I observed our involvement in Vietnam broaden from a handful of advisers in 1961 to whole combat units after 1965. Knowing that DACH would eventually send me there, I read

voraciously—particularly history and political science—all the while praying for God's will. In 1967 I returned from USAREUR, trained for 6 months with the 101st Airborne Division, and accompanied that unit in November 1967. My year in the War was simultaneously the most rewarding and the most shattering of my time in the Chaplaincy. I came away convinced that the death and destruction, given the ambiguous and often contradictory objectives of the conflict, raised profound theological issues about the Creator and Creation. I identified with a Lutheran Chaplain who soon after his resignation wrote in a journal, "A part of me died there everyday."

During the next two years I continued to study and pray about the War. At the behavioral level my response was generally limited to positive support of soldiers applying for CO status, and insistence that Chaplains and Commanders hear them fairly and in accordance with our own military regulations. Unfortunately the latter was sometimes seen as out of line, though thankfully not as a general rule. At all times I performed my military duties in an exceptional manner, regularly receiving commendations and excellent evaluations.

In February 1972 after 18 months in the same troop unit and congregation, I said in a sermon that "for me, the war is no longer morally defensible." The sermon quoted from similar statements by the United Methodist Council of Bishops, the General Conference, and my own Annual Conference. In addition reference was made to similar statements of several other Protestant denominational bodies. You will recall, or course, that 1972 was a troubled time in America, and the Army was greatly concerned about internal disorder.

My unit commander and his family heard and discussed the sermon—three Battalion Commanders and many soldiers were also present. We discussed the sermon as part of my ministry in that particular congregation and in the light of my self-understanding as a Methodist minister, with a variety of verbal responses but nobody quitting the congregation. There was surprisingly more reaction from Chaplains—most of it heavily negative. Only three or four Chaplains spoke in an openly supportive fashion—one, a Lutheran, insisted on the right to conscience, while not defending the position; the other, a Disciple, strongly agreed with me and was in the process of resignation. The general response from Chaplains was to distance themselves from me; I had rocked the boat too much, and they did not want to identify with me.

That period was scary and frequently lonely for me. If one's frame of reference is to be the community of faith, what happens when such distancing comes primarily from fellow clergy? Surprisingly my strength of spiritual support was from laity, primarily line officers who were part of the congregation—several of whom I remain close with 10 years later.

On reassignment in June 1972, I was passed over for selection to Lieutenant Colonel. Without my knowledge, the Commanding General refused a recommended award and wrote a letter attached to my OER. In

the letter he quoted from the sermon, said my social views were out of place in the Army, and recommended I be assigned to non-policy jobs out of contact with soldiers until I left active duty. I filed a lengthy reclaima, which with the support of several senior Chaplains eventually was approved. The reclaima included letters from my own bishop and endorsing agency stating that my statements were in line with denominational thinking.

## Looking Back

Looking back I can recognize several areas that need to be highlighted.

1. The process of ethical decision making earlier outlined did take place—though over a long period.
2. I was angry and did not always know it. Some of my behavior was undoubtedly precipitated by that anger. A later period of rather radical therapy helped me be more sensitive to the anger and respond to it in an appropriate manner. On the other hand I'm not sure I would have acted in what has been some times perceived as a prophetic manner had I not been angry.
3. I was surprised and disappointed at the response of Chaplains at my installation. My illusions about our support for one another were altered. I have to recognize the tension and ambiguity that I helped to force upon the Chaplains with whom I worked. The experience drove home the lesson, that for the closest to fire and ice, the immediate issue may be survival, in this case, economic survival as an officer in the military.
4. The one who chooses to stand in the fiery furnace, whether by conscious or unconscious choice, frequently seems to stand alone and isolated from his brothers and sisters in the faith.
5. The fourth point is really an illusion, for even in the fiery furnace, one is surrounded by a cloud of witnesses singing “And the Church, and the Church, and the Church.”

## **The Chaplain's Allegiance to His Church: A Response**

**The Reverend James P. Rickards**

I want to commend Chaplain Libby for his outstanding paper on "The Chaplains' Allegiance to His Church." I think he has covered the issues quite well. The three frames of reverence that he points out are indeed necessary and legitimate frames of reference. He moves from the general category of tradition of religious, ethical and philosophical thought and practice to show that the chaplain speaks from a particular tradition. For him, that is the body in which he is ordained. The United Methodist Church. It is a specific expression of the wider Christian Community. He is right—like all other clergy, is is responsible to the discipline and policy of his church. In item three, he states that the chaplain speaks from within the Army where he serves by permission of both the religious body and the military as an arm of the state. I would add the word, "simultaneously!" I think this is the key to understanding some of the relationships that we will discuss.

### **Institutional Duality**

Chaplain Libby has cited Hutcheson's book, "The Churches and the Chaplaincy," concerning the issue of institutional duality as a key point. I could not agree more with him on this point.

The whole system of Ecclesiastical Endorsement requires that each religious body certifies the services that the candidate for ministry in the armed forces is a truly representative ordained person of that religious body. The endorser is stating that, in the opinion of the religious body, the clergy person is a ready and available candidate prior to commissioning by



James P. Rickards is currently the coordinator for the National Conference on Ministry to the Armed Forces. The Conference represents all endorsing agencies or groups authorized to provide chaplains for any branch of the Armed Forces. He is an ordained United Methodist minister, who retired from the US Air Force, served six years on the Staff of the United Methodist Division of Chaplains as Director of Visitation and Pastoral Care, and was appointed to his current position in 1982.

the services. This is testimony to the delicate and yet workable system that honors both the church and the state. This system enables qualified clergy to work within an institutional system with all the rights and privileges of a member and yet, at the same time, to bear prior and continued allegiance to the religious body that endorsed him for service in the armed forces.

I know of no other officer in the armed forces except the chaplain that must regularly and simultaneously respond to the accountability system of both the church and the service into which he is commissioned. The sponsoring church reserves the right through the instrument of Ecclesiastical Endorsement to exercise its accountability option over the clergy in the armed forces. The clergy must have a valid Ecclesiastical Endorsement to remain on active duty or in the reserves as a functioning chaplain. The armed forces recognize this agreement. I strongly agree with Chaplain Libby's statement that the chaplain speaks from *within* the army where he serves by permission of both the religious body and military as an arm of the state.

## The Primary Frame of Reference

He moves on to state that the religious tradition is the primary frame of reference in matters of faith and morals. He quotes from the Army Regulations FM 16-5 (8 July 77) and AR 165-20 (15 Oct 79). They reinforce his position that "while serving in the Army I agree that my service is in the name of that denomination within parameters agreed upon by both institutions." I would like to state here that all three services have similar regulations. They are designed to do just what Chaplain Libby has stated.

I agree wholeheartedly with his next thrust that "*under normal circumstances*, this arrangement engenders no more tension for the military chaplain than those experienced by fellow clergy in other institutions to include denominational congregations." He is right, in my opinion, that the issues of power, prestige, authority, are present both in the civilian and military sphere and are generally worked out in day to day operations. They involve, for the most part, interpersonal issues that when dealt with by mature, cooperative and insightful chaplains are resolved rather quickly.

Chaplain Libby moves on to institutional policies or procedures that might rattle the cage of the dual institutional relationship. His process for dealing with the issues is most commendable. Would that all chaplains take the time and energy required to filter such questions through such a well thought-out-systematic process. I really feel that most chaplains do, and do it well! My experience tells me that most chaplains are able to "read" the situation quite well and to apply their resources in a most rewarding fashion. I would go on to say that generally neither the church nor the service are slighted in the process. Once in a while, however, there are some chaplains that, in specific situations, need to be faced with their

accountability to the church and likewise, at the same time by the service involved. There are adequate means for doing both—the Endorsing Agents, fellow chaplains and support groups on the one hand, and supervising chaplains and commanding officers on the other. I am talking of matters here that are of reasonable magnitude and not major issues of conscience (immature behavior, unclear denominational issues, etc).

Chaplain Libby has raised for us the point that “a major conflict of conscience, that is, one that shakes the roots of our being, will come about no more than once during our service as Chaplains.”

After reflecting on Chaplain Libby’s experience, I first want to share with him that it took much courage, then and now, to share his story. It is not an easy thing to expose oneself, to make oneself vulnerable and open to all kinds and sources of criticism. Thank you for your courage and your story!

## Faith in the System

When Endorsing Agents certify their candidate for ministry to the armed forces, they are taking a great risk. It is a risk that in “turning over” this duly endorsed clergy person to the armed forces, they trust the system to deal justly with that person. In other words, we will not interfere to try to rescue person that we place into a system or institution. This does not mean that we abandon them or cease to care about them. In fact, our concern and care is intensified. It does mean that we show our trust in the system. That includes promotion and retention policies, rules and regulations that include discipline when necessary, as well as praise and recognition. Above all, we believe the system has the right to manage its own internal affairs without our intervention. It would be with great reservation that the endorsing community would want to “tinker” with the machinery of the armed forces on behalf of its chaplains. Chaplains must learn to compete within the system. They must learn to operate and use the system in which they find themselves. Chaplain Libby did this. The system allows for all kinds of expression. He felt “shunned” by some of his fellow chaplains and redeemed by his senior chaplains in helping him void an OER. His personal struggles finally erupted into a position that was unavoidable for him. Right or wrong, he was free to make that decision and risk trust in the system. The Commanding General, from his perspective, may have felt justified in his actions; however, the chaplain was protected by the system in the delivery of a sermon.

What I am highlight is that, in my opinion, the services do have adequate means for clergy to be safeguarded in the delivery of the ministry even when a matter of conscience is raised. I am aware that not all issues are resolved to the total satisfaction of the chaplain involved.

In his allegiance to his church, the chaplain can trust the system. The armed forces have agreed to that in their contractual arrangements with the sponsoring churches. The Endorsing Community supports this

system and stands ready at any time to enter dialogue with individual chaplains, supervisory chaplains, commanding officers and other interested parties. Assisting the system might, at times, require confrontation. The confrontation would revolve around the right of the individual to be granted the rights and privileges of the already agreed upon contractual agreements, not to indiscriminately rescue chaplains.

The system will, at times, be “tested” by both the chaplain and the institution. The Endorsing Community, in its contractual work with the various institutional systems, is in constant dialogue to assure the supporting religious bodies that allegiance to the church receives top priority.

## The Chaplain's Allegiance to the Military

Chaplain (COL) John P. Ettershank

I \_\_\_\_\_, SSAN \_\_\_\_\_, having been appointed an officer in the Army of the United States, as indicated above in the grade of \_\_\_\_\_, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend The Constitution of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic, that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office upon which I am about to enter; SO HELP ME GOD.

A number of us have taken that oath at least twice: Once when being sworn into the Army of the United States as a reservist or National Guardsman and then later in our career when we were integrated into the Regular Army.

The first topic Jim Thompson asked me to wrestle with is, "The Chaplain's Allegiance to the Military." None of us has ever sworn or affirmed allegiance to the military per se. As our oath of allegiance states, our promise is to bear true faith and allegiance to the Constitution of the United States of America. Now I could trace the lines of allegiance through the Constitution to the Congress and its legal authority to raise an Army and further explore through the U.S. Code of Law, the legal authority of commissioned officers to Command and the responsibilities of members of a Command to obey the lawful orders of their superiors, but to do so in detail would be more proper for a member of the Judge Advocate General's Office than for a chaplain. Suffice it to say, I firmly believe we as commissioned chaplains owe allegiance to the military. It is, however, in the second part of the oath of allegiance that I would like to spend the greater part of the time allotted to me.



Chaplain Ettershank is a clergyman of the United presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. He is a graduate of the Army War College and the National War College. He is currently assigned as the Command Chaplain of the Training and Doctrine Command, Fort Monroe, Virginia.

## Duties of Office

That portion reads: "I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office upon which I am about to enter." But what are those duties? In Army Regulation 165-20, *Duties of Chaplains and Commanders' Responsibilities*, there is a reference to Title 10 of the United State Code section 3547 when the regulation speaks of the duties of chaplains.

The U.S. Code prescribes that, "Each chaplain shall, when practicable, hold appropriate religious services at least once on each Sunday for the Command to which he is assigned, and shall perform appropriate religious burial services for members of the Army who die while in the Command." That's all the Code says about our duties, and unfortunately there are a number of people who think that is all we do except for the offering during that service.

The Code is not explicit enough, so the Army has extrapolated the other inferences and has made them legally binding upon all of us who have sworn allegiance, through a series of regulations, orders, and directives.

AR 165-20, Chapter 2, states that the chaplain's primary duty is to provide for the religious and moral needs of the military community. Army regulations designate a chaplain as a staff officer and as such specify staff duties as they apply to the mission of the Command. Such duties, common to all staff officers, include advising, recommending, estimating, studying, coordinating, prioritizing, planning, monitoring, developing, and supervising. These duties are amplified for all officers in Field Manual 101-5 entitled, *The Staff Officer's Field Manual Staff Organization and Procedure*.

But as a chaplain, how does one become a complete Religious Staff Officer? What marks a chaplain as a viable and relevant advisor to the commander? All of our churches have adequately prepared us theologically to perform the religious services, rites, sacraments, and ordinances required by the U.S. Code. The Chaplains' School has assisted us in making the transition from a civilian to a military ministry. But what is our obligation? I feel that we, because of our allegiance to the military, must become soldiers/clerics. None of our staff duties will be relevant in a unit or our religious services effective until we behave and act creditably within our unit as accepted members of that Command.

## The Chaplain as Soldier

We need to look and act like soldiers. That will mean meeting the height/weight standards and passing the PT Test to become accepted in a unit. The chaplain must not only possess and apply theological teaching, but also be skilled in the military arts. Now by that I don't mean intimacy with all the military weaponry, but skilled in field living; map reading; maintenance of assigned equipment—tent, vehicle (including driving skills), stove, lantern, telephone, light kits; personal and public hygiene, and

elementary tactics. One must be knowledgeable about the unit's mission and capabilities whether it's Armor, Infantry, Air Defense Artillery, Air Calvary, Military Police, Field Artillery, or a Field Hospital.

Let me illustrate what I mean—and I have never met this chaplain. An Officer Record Brief (ORB) came across my desk assigning a Roman Catholic Captain Chaplain to a TRADOC organization. In reading the ORB, I discovered the usual educational achievements—BA, BD, Princeton M. Th.—earned while an advanced course student. When I looked at military education, I discovered he was a graduate of Chaplain Basic, Armor Basic, Infantry Basic and Chaplain Advanced courses.

A call to DACH-Personnel answered the questions such an ORB raised in my mind. While assigned to a FORSCOM unit, this chaplain availed himself, while in an Infantry Brigade, of the Non-Resident Basic Infantry Course. Subsequently, after transfer to an Armored Brigade, he took the Armored Officer's Non-Resident Basic Course. I'm sure that these courses helped him to become an effective soldier/priest in those units.

I served a good many years with three airborne divisions, and regardless of what you think about jumping out of "perfectly good airplanes," that service put me into close relationship with soldiers. On most airborne exercises, we parachuted into areas with only the equipment we could carry. Vehicles were few, usually only allotted to Commanders and Supply and Transport sections. We walked with soldiers and slept on shelter halves. Our duties forced us to share the soldiers' lot and portion. All of us, because we shared, and experienced, became accepted as integral parts of that unit—respected, possessing credibility. That type of duty also made us extremely available for counseling and religious services. We were thought of as soldiers but respected and treated as chaplains. Being in touch with the life of the Command enables the chaplain to advise with relevancy. He has earned the trust and respect afforded the office. Loyalty towards a Commander involves our prophetic role. Often our loyalty makes it necessary to bring the Commander "bad news." But like good tactical Commanders, we need to choose our tactical ground well. Never make waves over inconsequential issues, but be prepared to "fall on your sword" over moral/ethical issues. One can never really lose on ethical ground. The Commander may not agree but will judge you on the strength of your convictions.

## Two Loyalties

Within the military, we sometimes find conflicts about our allegiance. Our immediate Commander is the focal point for our allegiance. All our duties, both religious and staff, are executed under his supervision and by his direction. The Commander is responsible for all that we do or fail to do. It is his religious program which we professionally operate and it is for him/her that we discharge our multiple staff duties.

But what allegiance do we owe to supervisory chaplains who by law

have no command authority? If we recognize allegiance to senior/ supervisory chaplains, how do we serve both our Commander and chaplain? How do we recognize our responsibility in matters of area/denominational coverage when those responsibilities come not from our Commander, but from supervisory chaplains or church requirements? The church requirements do not present problems in allegiance, because most Commanders recognize the necessity to perform denominational requirements. On the other hand, Commanders do not relish time-sharing of what they have come to feel is one of their most valuable assets.

I feel it is incumbent upon all chaplains to educate Commanders about the necessity for area coverage. Shortages, denominational imbalances, and requisite skills possessed by few necessitate an integrated ministry, which is one of the requirements a supervisory/staff chaplain must accomplish. Without the use of chaplains assigned to other units, a comprehensive religious program for the total Command, community or installation could not be devised or implemented. While primary allegiance, by law, is directed through the chain of command to the Commander, it is important for us to remember our relationship to supervisory chaplains. We have a moral if not a legal obligation to assist/cooperate with supervisory chaplains.

## Faithful to Each Other

And it is in this area where ethical conflicts take place. Let me illustrate: Back-channel messages have reached MACOM chaplains as well as the Chief of Chaplains from Commanders who do not want Chaplain \_\_\_\_\_ assigned to their Command. Quite often the information on which Commanders base their nonconcurrence does not come from their own personal knowledge. Who reports this information to the Commander about a divorce, unaccompanied family, previous difficulty with other assignments, or a promotion nonselect? Certainly this is information that eventually will come to the Commander, but how does he get it immediately after the mention of a name? How does one reconcile loyalty or allegiance to the Command and loyalty to MACOM chaplain, Chief of Chaplains or even the Branch?

How does one reconcile the theological core of one's present ministry in the light of the imminent assignment of a chaplain of an entirely different theological leaning? What does one say to a Commander when one is going to be replaced by a Jewish chaplain or a Roman Catholic?

Another ethical dilemma that has bothered me personally is the manner in which chaplains occasionally play supervisory chaplain against Commander. "Sure I want to help out in that area, Post Chaplain!" "Colonel you know what the Post Chaplain wants me to do in addition to the heavy demands of our unit?" "I sure wish I could spend more time with the troops in the field but community concerns have to be met."

I'm not going to try to answer these ethical dilemmas except by

saying that allegiance is more than a single-edged sword. Allegiance, when coupled with the well and faithful discharge of duties, often causes concerns that overlap and are sometimes in conflict. That is the real world of Army ministry. Honesty in dealing with Commanders and supervisory chaplains is the only professional way in which to reduce the tensions which arise from differing and contrasting allegiances.

## A Humanizing Force

The second topic Jim wants me to speak to, is "Humanization in a de-humanizing environment." One of the prerogatives a speaker has every-time he appears behind a rostrum is to say what he pleases, define the topic as he chooses, or even to depart from the assigned subject.

I'm going to avail myself of one of those prerogatives right now. I don't believe we serve in a de-humanizing environment. I think the system, especially in Initial Entry Training (IET), de-personalizes individuals; this is of particular interest to TRADOC chaplains. We deal every day with young men and women who enlist in the U.S. Army for a variety of reasons: to get away from home; to secure training that is economically saleable in a civilian job market; travel; adventure; to find a spouse; patriotism. But if we're realistic, we are forced to admit that the bottom line may be economic—a reasonably well-paying job given the skill the enlistee presently holds. We have talked a lot about values currently in vogue among American teen-agers. Self-sacrifice is rarely ever mentioned, but the age group has been characterized by the phrase: "Seekers of instant gratification."

Yes, IET is a de-personalizing experience. The Army wants "look-alikes." Uniformity here is the byword, even to the manner in which BDU sleeves are rolled up. Think about *Army Times'* headlines which reflect major issues of the past few years in this area. Length of hair, shape of mustaches, length of sideburns, rings, jewelry, ear rings, beards all attest to the value placed on look-alikes, uniformity of appearance. The recent height/weight issue had little to do with performance, only with appearance.

Once the system, through the reception station, gets trainees to look alike, the training battalion begins its work to make them act alike. Conformity here becomes the norm: close-order drill, marching, movement in formation, performance-oriented skills with pupil-coach methodology. Closely inter-twined with act-alike is the subtle approach towards thinking alike: unanimity, united in opinion.

And what is the trainees perception of this process? Hear it said: "No one cares about me; only my attitude and my performance matter!"

This is a stressful time for trainees. They have no appreciation of what this de-personalization process seeks to accomplish. Its purpose is to subordinate personal interest for the welfare of the group, the squad or the platoon, and to cause concern for the welfare of others. It seeks to create

interdependence instead of independence. S.L.A. Marshall in his book, *Men Against Fire*, says that the strongest support a soldier has in combat is the fact that his squad members are going through the same ordeal and that they care about him as a member of that small organization. Cohesiveness, soldier bonding, and pride in the unit are the main goals of the Regimental System of Army Organization. There is meaning and usefulness when an individual subordinates self-interest to group-interest.

## Our Responsibility

And what is the chaplain's role/purpose/image in this depersonalizing purpose of the process. This is part and parcel of the military intelligence. Soldiers must be able to perform as part of a group in accomplishing the unit's mission. The chaplain must also set a watch, through personal relationships, intentional visitation programs, and counseling programs, to insure that de-personalization does not become de-humanizing. Haven't we helped to redefine trainee abuse? Haven't we continually insisted that trainee abuse must not be defined only in physical terms? Haven't we been on the cutting edge of establishing norms/ethics for proper leadership? Haven't we continually insisted that no treatment of soldiers be degrading? Haven't we insisted that derisive/profane language directed towards a trainee is abuse?

Let me quote from the recently approved US Bishops pastoral letter. "Those who train individuals for military duties must remember that the citizen does not lose his or her basic human rights by entrance into military service. No one, for whatever reason, can justly treat a military person with less dignity and respect than that demanded for and deserved by every human person.... Dehumanization of a nation's military personnel...in an effort to increase their fighting effectiveness robs them of basic human rights and freedoms, degrading them as persons. Attention must be given to the effects on military personnel themselves of the use of even legitimate means of conducting war.... Are they treated merely as instruments of war, insensitive as the weapons they use?"

The chaplain by demeanor, by acts, by self-sacrifice, through counseling and through preaching must attest to the fact that God cares. If God cares, the chaplain must care, must actively care about soldiers as individuals. The chaplain must demonstrate that individuals have worth and dignity, because worth and dignity are God-given. In some real way we must show that God loves them, that we love them and, that when one is in a proper relationship with God, God becomes an ever-present source of strength and consolation. Richard Neuhaus put it this way: "Our job is not to make them better soldiers; our job is to help them save their souls." Our ministry, accomplished because of our allegiance to the military, must never be mistaken for a combat multiplier.

Ours is a religious ministry aimed at salvation and eternal life. However, as soldiers identify with our ministry, actively participate in that

ministry, become reconciled to God their Father, and translate their personal faith into daily action, they become better persons. And if better persons, then perhaps better soldiers.

In summary, chaplains have a *legal* obligation to support the religious program of the Commander and loyalty to advise him. Chaplains have a *moral* obligation to assist and cooperate with supervisory chaplains, as they fulfill their legal obligations to the military. Our corporate and cooperative ministries to soldiers must affirm their dignity and freedom and human rights.

# The Chaplain's Allegiance to the Military: A Response

**Chaplain (MAJ) Roger D. Wight**

Effective ministry as a military chaplain requires an understanding of the basic structures of the military system in which the ministry is to be offered. In order to bring about effective ministry to the men and women of the service, we, by our own choice, take the oath of office. We choose to become soldiers and put on the green suit. Our allegiance is no longer totally to the parish and its people within the guidelines of our particular faith group. We now must *also* swear allegiance to the military. Allegiance to a religious structure is now tempered by our allegiance to the military.

As officers commissioned by direct appointment into the U.S. Army, we have an obligation to well and faithfully discharge our duties. Chaplain Ettershank has expounded well the duties of the chaplain, both as a religious cleric and as a staff officer. He indicated that we must be soldiers and clerics if we are to fulfill our allegiance to the military.

## Gaining Credibility

In order to be effective, chaplains must "behave" and "act" creditably within the unit. They need "to look and act like soldiers." Chaplains must meet the standards, be skilled in military arts, and be knowledgeable about the unit's mission and capabilities. To someone who does not know better, this may sound like an indictment. Somehow it sounds like chaplains are less than soldiers. We have to do something extra-special so that we are like them and act like them. I am here to say, "We are soldiers!" Our conduct ought to reflect nothing less. It seems to me that we have too long apologized. Even on television and in comic strips the chaplain is often



Chaplain Wight is a clergyman of the Church of God, Anderson, Indiana who was commissioned in 1969 in the US Army Reserves and came on active duty in 1970. His assignments include a combat tour in Vietnam. He is a certified Fellow in the College of Chaplains, American Protestant Hospital Association, a clinical member of the Association for Clinical Pastoral Education, and an associate regular member of the International Transactional Analysis Association. He is presently serving as the Hospital Chaplain at General Leonard Wood Army Community Hospital at Fort Leonard Wood.

portrayed negatively as a soldier. The communication of our image as a soldier/cleric ought to affirm the positive; we *are* soldiers and are not *trying* to be soldiers. When we are soldiers, this affirms our allegiance to the military and enhances our creditability with our people.

As chaplains, we owe allegiance to all of the following: The commander, the supervisory chaplain, our denominations, the chaplaincy as a branch and ourselves.

## External and Internal

Our allegiance can be described as both external and internal. Our allegiance to the military (internal) cannot be separated from our allegiance to our denomination (external). If we cannot well and faithfully discharge the duties of our office because of a conflict arising from our denomination's stance, then we will most likely have to choose to leave military service. An example of this might be a stance which a denomination would take on nuclear arms. Personal convictions involving nuclear arms could involve conflict which would not allow allegiance to the military. Separation is again indicated.

Internal allegiance to the military has as its immediate focal point the commander. Yet, we also have allegiance to the supervisory chaplain. The ethical dilemma of which Chaplain Ettershank spoke often causes concerns that overlap and lead to conflict. Particularly destructive to ministry are those occasions when chaplains play the supervisory chaplain against the commander. This plainly shows that the chaplain's allegiance is to himself rather than to ministry. Chaplain Ettershank said, "Honesty in dealing with command and supervisory chaplains is the only professional way in which to reduce the tensions which arise from differing and contrasting allegiances." Honesty is the best and healthiest way. There are risks involved when we have dual allegiances which may not agree with each other. Because the issue of allegiance is not specifically defined and interpretations may vary, there can be no one simple solution or answer.

Within our allegiance to the military we have an allegiance to the Chaplains Branch. This is important because the branch *reflects* the overall ministry of the chaplaincy. Chaplain Ettershank pointed out the vital importance of area coverage in this respect. Also it seems to me that we have an allegiance to one another, not to downgrade any chaplain's faith group, but rather to lift up the overall mission of the branch.

Chaplain Ettershank made several points in the section on "humanization in a de-humanizing environment." I especially like the last part of that section where he said, "The chaplain by demeanor, by acts, by self-sacrifice, through counseling and through preaching must attest to the fact that God cares." He further went on to quote Richard Neuhaus who basically said our jobs are not to make them better soldiers, our job is to help save their souls. While it is true that it is not our job description to make them better soldiers, it is my firm conviction that our ministry will

make them better; that is, not only better persons, but most definitely better soldiers. The words, "if better persons, then perhaps better soldiers" seems a bit understated.

We have seen that effective ministry within the military requires our allegiance to the military. Although this has not been specifically defined, the overall guidelines are there. Suffice it to say, our allegiance to the military must be intertwined with our allegiance to God and our ministry to bring God to man and man to God.

# The Chaplain as an Advocate of Religious Freedom

Chaplain (MAJ) Jerry E. Malone

My first happy years of Sunday School were spent in a church that many consider a cult. My commitment to Christ was solidified in a parachurch organization about which many people say dozens of nasty things. I am presently part of a denomination which receives a blank stare when I say its name. For these reasons, I understand many issues of religious freedom, and I personally feel some of the emotion of those who are separate from the mainstream of contemporary religious thought. If our society only entertained certain exclusive religious choices, I would be an outcast. So hand in hand with my own Christian growth, I have held the essential hypostasis of American religious pluralism. As a chaplain, this means that I positively accept and prophetically advocate the preservation of individual and group religious identity. In America, hundreds and hundreds of belief systems exist. Wilford Smith says, The spirit of ecumenism in the sense of tolerance and respect for others beliefs appears to remain strong, but instead of uniting into one, churches seem to be proliferating.<sup>1</sup> Nobody wants to wear the same religious coat as the person down the street. Each person has unique approaches of religious style and personally-held religious convictions.

I hear ghost stories, and sometimes I become scared! When some people speak of pluralism, I shake in my boots! My deepest values get trampled! For example, S.A. Nogisian says that, instead of asserting the truth or falsity of a given tradition, we must recognize...that a number of religions are *equally valid*. The implications of such a view on mission-oriented religions will undeniably be drastic. But it is time that adherents of

<sup>1</sup>Wilford E. Smith, "Pluralistic Developments in America As They May Influence the Military Chaplaincy," *Military Chaplains' Review*. DA PAM 165-102, (1974), p. 39.



Chaplain Malone is a clergyman of the Conservative Congregational Christian Conference, and is endorsed by the National Association of Evangelicals. He has completed a one-year residency in CPE, and is currently enrolled in the Doctor of Ministry program at Covenant Theological Seminary in St. Louis. He entered active duty in 1974, and serves currently as the Chaplain of the 93d Evacuation Hospital at Fort Leonard Wood.

such religions confront the issue of religious pluralism and reassess the situation in the light of the emerging world community.<sup>2</sup> I am mission-oriented, and I firmly intend to maintain this value, with a view toward opposition of those who are to limit my freedom to express evangelism. And, I am quick to assert to those who hold to the equal validity of many religions—I am your advocate. the view from which I come has been recently expressed by John Warwick Montgomery in an article about school prayer:

One could ask: Was America ever a Christian nation? Were the founding fathers predominantly evangelicals or essentially deists? Does the First Amendment forbid the political establishment of all religion, or did it favor one Christian denomination over against others? The Calvinist “reconstructionists” and many evangelicals would argue that our country was founded on a theistic base and that public school prayer is simply a reflection of that perspective. I, however, would vigorously maintain that our nation is *de jure* and *de facto*, a pluralistic society, affording religious neutrality—and evangelistic possibility—to all its citizens.<sup>3</sup>

The position of religious neutrality cuts the leash of control over present and future forms of evangelistic outreach. Recently, I received a letter from the Executive Secretary of the Commission on Chaplains of the National Association of Evangelicals. This person, Mr. Floyd Robertson, my endorser, was soliciting comments from his many chaplains on how significant differences of opinion among chaplains should be resolved. Of specific interest are the sensitivities and firm beliefs of chaplains participating in a General Protestant Worship Service, and the occasional lack of understanding line officers have for the meaning of religious freedom in the military. Mr. Robertson says there may be a real need for some carefully drafted guidelines which would be useful in helping chaplains resolve their differences and be available in case a chaplain needs to explain his prerogatives to his commander.<sup>4</sup> We are not simply defenders of our own religious freedom, but must also defend the religious freedom of all military persons. With Bishop Paul Moore, we need to maintain awareness that when somebody else's liberties are taken away, our own

<sup>2</sup>S.A. Nigosian, “The Challenge of Religious Pluralism,” *The Chaplaincy*, Vol. II, No. 3, (3rd Quarter, 1970), pp. 27, 28.

<sup>3</sup>John Warwick Montgomery, “School Prayers: A Common Danger,” *Christianity Today*, Vol. XXVI, No. 9, (7 May 1983), p. 59.

<sup>4</sup>Floyd Robertson, National Association of Evangelicals, *Commission on Chaplains Newsletter*, (Washington DC: 1430 K Street Nw, 20005, 14 April 1983).

liberties are on the verge of being taken away.<sup>5</sup> Ours is not a selfish existence, but one of advocacy for others.

## The Chaplains Reason To Be

Army Training 1990, Chaplain Training Strategy lists two requirements for Chaplain religious coverage. The first paragraph states: As representatives of their denominations, chaplains possess denominationally-oriented attitudes, values, self-perceptions and perceptions of others.<sup>6</sup> Relating this to the proclamation of the gospel, I take note of a long tradition of evangelism-centered chaplains. The Great Awakening of the period of the mid-1700's was, in part, led by the son of a chaplain, Jonathan Edwards. Roy Honeywell says that undoubtedly this movement prepared the way for the tremendous growth of the evangelical churches, which dominated the chaplaincy of the Civil War and made evangelism more than ever before the chaplain's first responsibility.<sup>7</sup> However, I wish to set beside this position another possibility, and this is covered in the second paragraph of Army Training 1990, Chaplain Training Strategy: Chaplains responsible for Unit Religious Coverage must respond to religious pluralism and provide for the free exercise of religion of Army personnel.<sup>8</sup> The first paragraph speaks of what the chaplain possesses, but the second decides how the chaplain is primarily to respond. Quite frankly, our first response is to religious freedom, knowing that Evangelism thrives on true freedom and is crushed by social conformity.<sup>9</sup>

The Army Chaplaincy is an advocate of religious freedom. Chief of Chaplains, Chaplain Patrick J. Hessian has said:

Chaplains can exemplify the holiday spirit, and realize the *raison d'être* of their role as military chaplain, by a renewed sensitivity to the rights of these soldiers whose religious views are "different" from our own. In order to minister to their needs, I urge chaplains to work with them and their commanders to insure that no requirement is made which either directly or indirectly prohibits, hinders, or restricts them in the observance of their religious beliefs. Only when the command can demonstrate a compelling military need

<sup>5</sup>Bishop Paul Moore, Jr., "Parish Pluralism & Future Forms of Ministry," *Military Chaplains' Review*, DA PAM 165-116 (Winter, 1978), p. 42.

<sup>6</sup>Department of the Army, *Army Training 1990, Chaplain Training Strategy*, (Washington DC: Office of the Chief of Chaplains, May 1983), p. 3

<sup>7</sup>Honeywell, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

<sup>8</sup>Department of the Army, Army Training 1990, Chaplain Training Strategy, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

<sup>9</sup>Montgomery, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

such as a clear and immediate danger to public safety, good order, or public health should exception to this principle be granted. Even if soldiers' beliefs and practices are unpopular, annoying or distasteful to us or our commanders, or out of step with the majority of soldiers of their own denomination or sect, we must not restrict their religious rights as long as they are sincere. Our view of the truth or falsehood in their belief should not be the issue.<sup>10</sup>

The recent challenge to the constitutionality of the US Army Chaplaincy posed by Katcoff V. Marsh, Civil Action No 79 C 2986, highlighted this issue.<sup>11</sup> The plaintiffs charge the Army Chaplaincy with the violation of the establishment clause of the United States Constitution. The First Amendment states: "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof...." They say that the Government lends its prestige, influence and power to organized religion, inculcating religious values, and favoring religion over non-religion and certain religions over others. Granting rank, uniforms, chapels, literature, the use of general Protestant services, the requirement of minimum educational standards, denominational participation in recruitment, selection, and endorsement of chaplains, has effectively excluded groups having lower schooling standards.

In measuring past cases of First Amendment violations, a three-pronged test has been used: (1) The purpose, (2) the primary effect, and (3) excessive entanglement. But the defense on behalf of the chaplaincy states this test is inadequate because it does not co-consider the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment. If the Chaplaincy were abolished for Establishment Clause purposes, then who would advocate and insure the Free Exercise rights of military personnel? In effect, the dismantling of the Army chaplaincy would result in a violation of the First Amendment's guarantee of Free Exercise. Because of war conditions, regular and irregular assignment rotations, frequent and extensive field training, the rapid deployment and readiness capability, overseas duty, family separation, and isolation, the Army chaplain possesses unique training and experience that cannot be accommodated by a civilian replacement. Although the plaintiffs used the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod as examples of effective ministry to the soldiers, I personally can account for few times in my European tour of duty in which they were involved in ministry to our personnel. I do not wish to discount their individual ministry, but they did not have effective numbers of clergy: they needed to use military phones

<sup>10</sup>Patrick J. Hessian, *Chaplain Newsletter* (Washington DC: Office of the Chief of Chaplains, 1 Dec 82).

<sup>11</sup>Israel Drazin, "Katcoff vs Marsh, Civil Action No. 79 C 2986, A Challenge to the Constitutionality of the Army Chaplaincy," (Washington DC: Office of the Chief of Chaplains, 21 Mar 83). (Most legal material in this article is condensed from this letter.)

and buildings anyway; and they did not possess the inside sense of the Army system as does a chaplain. William Hughes comments about the civilian Christian Commissions experience of exclusion in a combat environment in 1861:

The Commission delegates did not stay in areas other than combat zones. Indeed, part of their mission was to comfort the wounded and dying at the front. Nonetheless, this raised serious problems for the commanders in those areas. The simplest way for them to handle civilian traffic in the area was to close the area to all civilians.<sup>12</sup>

Logically, our Chaplain “reason to be” is among the issues of the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment.

There are six critical issues for all Army chaplains as they deal with the religious rights of soldiers and their families: (1) A limited intrusion into free exercise is allowed when the government can show a compelling state interest. The interest must be closely fitted and narrowly drawn. It cannot be a casual relationship to state interest. Unpopularity, annoyance and distastefulness are not criteria. Only the gravest abuses, endangering paramount interest, are permissible for limitation. Also, demonstration of the failure of less restrictive means to achieve the desired ends is necessary. (2) The belief system cannot be questioned as to its truth or falsity, its worthiness, or its legitimacy. Only the individual's sincerity can be questioned, or whether or not the belief is truly religious in the persons own scheme of things. The belief can be tested as having a meaningful place in a person's life parallel to that filled by an orthodox belief in God. In *Theriault v. Carlson*, an apparent game of claiming a fake religion and beginning the Church of the New Song in prison was denounced as a fraud and fake by the prison chaplain. Theriault was refused the right to conduct services because the religion was not recognized. Although the court recognized the possibility of a game, it could not declare the petitioners' religion illegitimate.<sup>13</sup>

(3) A person may not be forced to choose between following the precepts of her religion and forfeiting benefits, on the one hand, and abandoning one of the percepts of her religion in order to accept work on the other hand. (*Sherbert v. Verner*, at 404).<sup>14</sup>

(4) If an individual's religious response differs from the practice of the denomination in question, the individual is protected under the Free Exercise Clause. The individuals observance and religious commitment are ultimately important.

<sup>12</sup>Hughes, “The United Methodist Church and the U.S. Military Chaplaincy (1736-1920),” *The Chaplain*, (August 1970), pp. 28, 29.

<sup>13</sup>Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

<sup>14</sup>Drazin, *op. cit.*, legal reference is continued from his eight-page letter.

(5) A strange and annoying religious practice must not be prejudiced against unless there is demonstration of a substantial threat to public safety, good order, or public health. Our respect and sensitivity ought to be directed toward those whose beliefs and practices are different and opposed to our own. The government can show no favoritism—neither should we.

(6) The government may investigate if cults break laws, but the cult issue (touching three to five million young people) is to be locally considered. There is no basis for declaring entire groups illegal. Local and present adverse conditions must be demonstrated. Riot, disorder, interference with traffic, drugs, child labor, and human sacrifice are violations of the law and permissible to oppose.

To bring these issues directly into the military setting, Chaplain (COL) Israel Drazin suggested that we apply the civilian standard of compelling state interest to the military as the compelling military interest test. I will present some hypothetical examples:

**Example 1:** A Seventh-Day Adventist soldier does not wish to violate his own belief of no work on the Sabbath. The Company Commander's response is, "if I let him off then I've got to let everyone off." AR 165-20 (3-2) allows freedom if military requirements are not affected. The phrase, "military requirements," or even "military necessity," is far from compelling military need. What should the chaplain do?

**Example 2:** A Roman Catholic female is on a field maneuver with a Battalion Aid Station. Because of the shortage of Catholic priests, the only opportunity to worship is Sunday morning at the Post Chapel. However, the war-game scenario is especially intense during that time when the Mass is scheduled. The commander is not in good position to release a vehicle to transport her to the Mass. In addition, he mentions her deportment as being consistently less than Christian. What is the chaplain's response?

**Example 3:** Several months ago, a soldier was spiritually moved after viewing the biographical motion picture on the life of Eric Liddell, *Chariots of Fire*, and now he has come to the decision that he cannot pull guard duty, or any other work, on Sunday. His local Baptist pastor has told the commander of the sincerity and excellent demeanor of this soldier, but also said, wars must be fought on Sunday, too! What is the chaplain's position?

**Example 4:** A Chapel Activity Specialist (CAS) is a Latter-Day Saint, and desires to be absent from Sunday morning duty to lead worship at his own congregation. He says that there are other CAS, and they can work Sunday mornings. He will make up for it during the week. The other CAS disagree, and think this is unfair. What is the chaplain's advocacy? If we say, "no," can we demonstrate that less restrictive means are not available to achieve our ends?

**Example 5:** A Satanist group wants to have midnight monthly meetings (at

the full moon) in our chapel. What does the chaplain do, remembering that compelling military interest means public safety, good order, and health are in jeopardy? In addition, we must keep in mind that no local organization presently constituted can be ousted simply because of a national organizations reputation. And the local threat needs to be clear, present, and substantial.

**Example 6:** Several years ago, I organized and encouraged Campus Crusade for Christ “Here’s Life America.” The Post Chaplain claimed religious proselytizing is not permitted (AR 165-20, 3-3d), and the program could not be initiated. Talking to the Chief of Staff, and receiving legal counsel, I discovered a difference between presenting the gospel and proselytizing. Against the wishes of the Post Chaplain, a phone center was established and the evangelistic campaign was both initiated and completed. We need to legitimize the presentation of our various religious views in the military. We should only stand against coercive or repressive aspects of proselytizing.

## Theology and Pluralism Advocacy

Give thanks to the LORD, for He is good, (Psalm 136:1). The goodness of God is an essential characteristic of God and a starting place for Chaplain advocacy.<sup>15</sup> God is always good, and there is no time when He is not good, nor is there an occasion when His actions are less than good. From James 1:17, we understand that He is the Giver of good things and perfect gifts. For us, this means an awareness of our own good-less-ness as providers, but gives us the primary spiritual leitmotif to be background music to God’s symphony in the lives of those creatures of His.

The chaplain is a servant. A servant in the Old Testament follows the pattern of the royal servant of a monarch. A professional army officer and a minister of state viewed their relationship with the king as servanthood.<sup>16</sup> This relationship was a covenant agreement of mutual benefit bound and motivated by closeness and commitment of the pledge. Neither in the Old Testament or in the New Testament is the servant in a slave role as in the Greek or Roman sense. The Apostle Paul speaks of himself as a servant, called as an Apostle (Romans 1:1). This faithful and loving relationship of servanthood which we possess with our God is a beautiful model for our actions in the defense of religious freedom for others. From this servant concept, it is easier to notice the care of Yahweh for the stranger in the land of Israel, and the interest Jesus displays to the Samaritan woman or the Roman Centurion.

Bishop Paul Moore, Jr. has said that our criterion is whether or not

<sup>15</sup>Leroy Ness, personal conversation in San Antonio on 26 Apr 83.

<sup>16</sup>J. Gordon Harris, “The Chaplain as a Servant of God,” *The Chaplaincy*, Vol. II, No. 3 (3rd Quarter, 1979), p. 3.

the actions of a given group enlarges the Holy Family; and, beyond this, *acting* as if those for whom we advocate are members of the Holy Family. We do not stop believing that we are the truest, but we stop putting other people down. Therefore, as we try to understand God, we need to be open, literally stretching to the truth which is coming to us from every part of his prodigal creation.<sup>17</sup>

The Philippians 2 servant is able to bypass personal needs and look to the needs of the parish-at-large. Our issue is to look beyond our provincial Chaplain needs.

## Effects on the Chaplain's Practical Ministry

As the Army's defenders of faith and freedom, I offer a few suggestions:

(1) We need to decide an everyday plan of high esteem and value (respecting what is right in the sight of all men, Romans 12:17) for all persons, particularly minority religious views and views which are offensive or contrary to our own. Grant Shockley suggests that we conscientize to take action against repressive elements.<sup>18</sup>

(2) We need to utilize our listening skills to identify the real problem in any particular religious freedom crisis, modeling care for each persons values and belief system.

(3) As with Conscientious Objector applications, we cannot degrade personal faith. We are not to say what belief system is theologically correct or incorrect, but to look within the individual to understand the place of faith in that person's being and life, seeing how that faith is genuinely held.

(4) We need to open our chapels and facilities to groups of all religious persuasion. With this, we need a redefinition of what constitutes a major faith, and a reconsideration of prime Sunday morning time for Chaplain-led worship services which may often be smaller in attendance than, for example, a Gospel Service.

(5) The educational standards need revision to allow the free flow of Chaplains representing the religious expressions of our lower socio-economic constituents, or of other groups which simply do not believe that education is the mark of a clergyperson.

It is the soldier's right to believe in God. It is the soldier's right to express these beliefs with a variety of worship forms. It is the soldier's right to inform others about his/her beliefs in ministry and outreach. It is the Chaplain's responsibility to be the religious advocate for these soldiers and their religious expressions.

<sup>17</sup>Moore, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

<sup>18</sup>Grant S. Shockley, "Ethnic Pluralism and Future Forms of Ministry," *Military Chaplains' Review*, DA PAM 165-116, (Winter, 1978), pp. 31-33.

# The Chaplain as an Advocate of Religious Freedom: A Response

Colonel Peter J. Kane

This is a very brief and general response to the presentation, *The Chaplain as an Advocate of Religious Freedom*. The stated goals of the presentation are: (1) presenting the gospel in a pluralistic community, and; (2) protecting the rights of those who are different.

Being an advocate by profession, I appreciate the significance of the title "advocate"—a role not always popular or understood, but always necessary.

It is in this context that I offer—from one professional advocate to other professional advocates—a few observations, questions, and challenges regarding the "Chaplain as an Advocate of Religious Freedom."

Our Constitution guarantees and multitudinous court decisions reinforce that we may freely exercise the "religious faith" of our choice. I, therefore, have no argument with that premise of the presentation.

## A Pluralistic Society

That we are a pluralistic society is not disputed. Whether or not we are a completely pluralistic society is questionable. I say "completely pluralistic" because the author seems to suggest this and I really cannot completely disagree. However, my response is, "so what?"

Ours always was and probably always will be a pluralistic society. However, this pluralism has always been and may always be qualified, in the sense that one or more elements thereof believe they are denied rights and freedoms. This is a fact of life equally in the civilian and military communities and apparently involves religious freedom, at least in the



Colonel Kane entered the Army National Guard in 1959, and received a Direct Commission in the Judge Advocate General's Corps in 1962. He has served in a variety of positions on active duty, and is currently serving as the Staff Judge Advocate at Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri.

view of the author. I say apparently, because the author appears to believe that religious freedom in the military community is incomplete. I sense a belief by the author that religious freedom means recognition and support of traditional major denominations and non-support of others; that true religious freedom is lacking; that some military members are denied their Constitutional right to freedom of religion, that there is a threat to religious freedom; and that anything less than the absolute freedom to practice individual religious preference is a denial of a constitutionally guaranteed right—the right to religious freedom. I find in the author's presentation such phrases as "the many issues of religious freedom," "mainstream of contemporary religious thought," "sometimes lack of understanding line officers have for the meaning of religious freedom in the military," and "our Constitutional rights are not set aside when we join the Armed Forces."

What do these statements mean? What are the issues of religious freedom, the mainstream of contemporary religious thought, religion, freedom, freedom of religion? The author does not say. He appears to intimate that anything less than total individual freedom is wrong.

These subjects can be debated, discussed, and confused by scholars, theologians, lawyers and laymen forever. Is it any wonder that some line officers might not really understand the meaning of religious freedom in the military—at least from a chaplain's perspective (and that assumes that you do?)

## The Mission

Although our Constitutional rights are not set aside when we join the Armed Forces, the specific freedoms enjoyed as civilians are in fact modified for the soldier to the degree necessary to enable the Army to accomplish its mission. There are numerous Supreme Court decisions which specifically recognize that the mission of the Armed Forces requires a higher degree of discipline and sacrifice of military personnel and carries with it some loss of individual freedom.

This Army was never designed to be, was not, is not, and hopefully never will be a democratic organization. Its mission dictates otherwise. Still, it affords more Constitutional protections and freedoms, including that of religion, than most the civilian environment.

The bottom line is that any one may believe in and pursue any religious faith. When the exercise, pursuit, or practice thereof conflicts with the mission, however, that exercise may well be curtailed.

The Armed Forces are not a social experiment designed to accommodate the various rights and freedoms of those who join them. When the exercise of your constitutionally guaranteed rights conflicts with the legitimate mission of the Armed Forces your options are clear: Reconcile the two or find another less demanding environment in which to pursue them.

The second paragraph of "Army Training 1990, Chaplain Training

Strategy” tells you that: “Chaplains...must respond to religious pluralism and provide for the free exercise of religion of Army personnel.” This tells you advocates what to do—*not how* to do it. The how is your challenge. I do not envy you your task.

Remember John 3:16, “...Whosoever believeth in me shall not perish but have ever lasting life.” For all advocates that believeth, be all you can be.

# The Roman Catholic Chaplain in the Third Christian Epoch

**Chaplain (COL) Robert J. Ennis**

Recently I read in two different contexts references to Karl Rahner's conceptual analysis of the evolution of the Church in our times. I'm really not in a position to critique his thesis; however, since his views are discussed favorably by contemporary theologians, I may reasonably conclude that they have some credibility. I would like to mention Rahner's views as a background for my remarks to you today.

## The Third Epoch

Karl Rahner believes that the Church is at the beginning of "A Continental Shift" of gigantic magnitude. We are at the beginning of a new epoch in Christianity. The Church, in his view, is at the beginning stage of her self realization as "World Church." In his opinion, there have been only two other epochs in the history of Christianity. The first was very brief, it included only those years in which Christianity was preached in Israel to Israelites. The second epoch began with the momentum of the first Pentecost, but it was not actualized until Saint Paul began to preach to the Gentiles. This second epoch is characterized by what we call today European/Western Christianity. In a temporal sense, it is the largest era thus far in Christian history. Rahner believes that the third epoch, Christianity's coming of age as World Church, was triggered by the calling of the Second Vatican Council by Pope John XXIII. I think it is possible for us to examine recent history, that is, the last two decades, and pick out some elements that are indicative of this new notion of Church.

The single most significant element, and a critical one in the Roman



Chaplain Ennis is a Roman Catholic priest of the diocese of Brooklyn, New York. After serving six years in a Brooklyn parish, he was commissioned as a US Army Chaplain in 1964. He has served in a variety of assignments, and is currently serving as the Deputy Commandant of the US Army Chaplain Center and School at Fort Monmouth, NJ.

Catholic Church today, is the ever decreasing number of active ordained priests. It is something that is frequently mentioned in Catholic periodicals and personnel studies. For some few hostile persons this might offer a hopeful sign of the demise of the Catholic Church. I am convinced, however, that they are mistaken. I believe that the Catholic Church in America and in the world may well be in one of its most vigorous eras. In the military, for example, many of the top leaders today are active Roman Catholics. This is true of our recently retired Chief of Staff, General Meyer, and true of the present Chief of Naval Operations. I remember a few years ago as Division Chaplain at Fort Polk that three out of the five 06 positions in that Division were held by Roman catholics who were active members of the Church. I do not think these observations are mere accidents; rather, they are characteristic of the kind of leadership that exists in the Church today. Leadership, not only in the clerical or ecclesiastical aspect of the Church, but even more importantly, in the lay sector of the Church.

Another indication of the life of the Catholic Church today is the recently published document of the Catholic Bishops on War and Peace. This statement has generated more interest on a national level in both political and military spheres than any other moral issue in the last decade. That kind of influence is powerful, and that kind of influence is indicative of life. If Karl Rahner's thesis that the Chruch is entering a new age is correct, I think we can expect new form and new function in the Catholic Church. I see this form and function evolving from the teachings introduced, and slowly being implemented, since the Second Vatican Council.

## A Sacramental Ministry

The first goal of my presentation today is to address the emphasis of the Roman Catholic Chaplain's ministry in a pluralistic Army. Traditionally, the emphasis in ministry for the Catholic Chaplain has been sacramental. This is the result of the internal attitude of the Church and the consequent training that existed into the mid-sixties, the era prior to the Second Vatican Council. We were taught to be conveyors of grace through the sacraments, to be teachers of the Word, and to be prophets within the community. Roughly speaking, I think the order in which I presented those tasks is the order of emphasis that the Church proposed. The view was strictly inward. We learned little about the Church as a member of the larger Christian community, or about the pluralistic non-church world, or about the possibility of tapping the resources that exist outside the dimensions of the ordained priesthood.

## The Priest as a Channel of Resource

The emphasis of ministry for the Catholic Chaplain in a pluralistic Army can perhaps be best described as a channel of resources. He must be a fully developed human being sensitive to the needs of the worshiping commun-

ity and the larger community around him and know how to satisfy those needs. He must embody the values, hopes and aspirations of the community and skillfully blend the available resources to help actualize them. I think that it is important for us to realize that the traditional roles can no longer do the job. Many Catholic Chaplains are fearful of handing over certain functions to lay leaders or to others. If we are going to become attuned to the image of the Church that is evolving in this new age, however, I think it is of paramount importance to realize our role as a channel of resources. In practical terms, what I mean by that is that the Catholic Chaplain has to be really deeply involved in planning, programming and budgeting for the activities on his installation and for his unit. I think he has to be a man who is on the cutting edge of parish development. He has to be a person who is willing to explore the various possibilities for the development and training of lay leaders of his community. There are rich resources to be found in every civilian diocese. It is true, some dioceses are more advanced than others; nevertheless, in each diocese and at many Catholic institutions of learning there is a variety of programs designed to assist priests everywhere to capitalize on all the resources around them. The priest is not just a minister who gives the sacraments and who preaches the Word; he should share that ministry as much as he can. I realize that traditionally many priests in the military have shied away from the general area of administration, "I can't get involved in that, I have to take care of my people. I have to give them the sacraments. I have to preach the Word to them or no one else will do it." Well, I think that's backward thinking today. I believe it's important rather for us to step back and take a look at the possibilities that are available to us if we are willing to plan, if we are willing to share some traditional functions and roles that the Church now invites us to share with others.

In the civilian setting one of the best examples of a priest as a channel of resources is in Saint Mary's Parish in Colts Neck, N.J. The pastor there, Father Bill Bausch has a vibrant parish and has written several books on ministry in the modern Church. His associate is a Sister, a nun. She resides away from the parish plant, just in case you're wondering. He has the parish so highly organized that it probably can run without him on a day-to-day basis except for daily Mass. There are functioning committees for every conceivable aspect of ministry. For example, my secretary's husband, Tony Moscicki, was invited by the pastor to go on a three week trip to take a course in a particular aspect of spirituality. The whole bill was paid for by the parish, just as the Army pays for TDY's. Upon his return, he was required to share what he learned in a series of classes in the parish adult education program. That is the kind of thing the pastor as a channel of resources accomplishes in Saint Mary's Parish.

Bill Bausch is a man with vision. There are many priests who, clinging to old notions, find his style of ministry unacceptable. There are many people who don't care to participate in this kind of parish life; yet, it is the kind of parish life, in my opinion, to which we are being called. Some

aspects of this style of ministry are easily transferable to the pluralistic setting in which we find ourselves in the service. The Catholic Chaplain who becomes a channel of resources and a parish developer can contribute by his own example, and by sharing his personal and professional skills for the enhancement of the total religious program on the installation. At the same time the Catholic Channel of Resources may employ aspects of non-Catholic programs as part of the Catholic portion of the total religious program or employ non-Catholic individuals to accomplish various aspects of the program. Getting the best for the most in a pluralistic environment is the goal.

A question that comes to mind is: How do you, as a non-Catholic Christian minister or other minister feel about this theory? How does it fit into the context of your ministry? How does it fit into the plan of ministry for the whole installation? I think it is very important, especially when there are changing forms of ministry within a particular denomination, to survey all those who live and function in that same community in order to discern reactions, design ways of mutual assistance, and discover possible causes of friction, so that system may function more smoothly. A pluralistic community that is characterized by cooperation and mutual respect is a truthful witness to the traditions that it represents.

## **Planning for Ministry**

The second goal of this brief presentation is the discovery and utilization of the available resources for ministry to which I have just referred. The Catholic Chaplain as the orchestrator or the channel of resources must first of all be a planner. He's got to sit down and think about what he wants to do. He's got to share those thoughts with the other Catholic Chaplains around him as well as with the Catholic community. He must then share the plans with the installation chaplains and members of the chaplaincy team upon whom they may impact. He needs to go to the local community to see what is available to help him implement his plan. He needs to survey the congregation including those who no longer attend for one reason or another and who may only need an invitation to come back—maybe a personal invitation—in order to see what kind of resources he has to implement plans. Every Catholic Dioceses has a newspaper. Many Catholic Dioceses have newsletters for clergy. Religious communities have newsletters for clergy. These kinds of information-sharing publications often contain precious items of information on what kind of resources exist and are available. Publications like *Crux*, *Origins*, *Overview* offer brief synopses of programs in local churches and communities. Frequently, they contain good suggestions for resourcing ministry.

## **A Broadened Vision**

There are really two things that need to happen for the Catholic Chaplain,

for his Catholic community and for the larger community at any installation. The first is that there must be the *right attitude*. There has to be a total openness, without any futile clinging to old traditions that will die with the person who clings to them. The second thing is *education*. Catholic Chaplains need opportunities for education that will broaden their views of ministry and align them with the thinking of the Second Vatican Council. Lay persons need education to help prepare them for leadership positions in the worshiping community. I don't have any great plan as to how all this can be accomplished, but I do think those are the two basic things that we must begin to address if we are going to be attuned to the leadings of the Spirit in the new epoch of World Church.

I began my comments by referring to the first Pentecost as a kind of symbol of the second epoch of Christianity. I referred to the Second Vatican Council as the primary symbol of the third epoch in Christianity. I would like now to quote from a reflection that appeared in the Sisters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, Northeast Province, Newsletter. The whole letter is devoted to the meeting of the bishops in Chicago where they recently voted on The Pastoral Letter on War and Peace. Sister Juliana, the author, first spoke about the ballroom in Chicago where all of this happened, but, then she went on to say the following: "There was another room in the Palmer House which made clear and would symbolize for me the presence of the Spirit which would burst forth in such clarity among the bishops themselves. That room was neither grand nor filled with overwhelming numbers of bishops, press correspondents, or television cameras. It was always filled, however, with people in prayer. The room, hidden away on the seventh floor of the hotel, became a place of vigil for the entire duration of the bishops' meeting. People came from all over to join in prayer there and to be a presence of courage and intercession for the ones who actually had to decide upon the final wording of The Pastoral. The room was small and somewhat littered with papers, etc., but it was holy ground. Thousands of paper cranes decorated the walls and hundreds of people passed through in vigil. Late in the night at the end of the first day of discussions, three of us from the Committee joined the people in prayer there. We prayed with them, heard God's Word with them and rejoiced gently with the gift of the first afternoon's discussion. One of those present was a bishop who was so moved by the events of the day that he could only speak with tears of gratitude. We knew then, I think, that all of our words, all of our meetings, all of the carefully reasoned logic and theological thinking did not really matter. Peace would come, the Spirit would be present only because of the prayer of the people. Pentecost happened in the Grand Ballroom because the Spirit of God was alive in the other rooms in that hotel and everywhere in our country." I really believe that the Spirit is alive everywhere in our country. The number of ordained clergy in the Catholic ranks is slim and getting slimmer. Personally, I do not see any light at the end of the tunnel for the traditional mode of ordained clergy. I love the priesthood. I love its variety of ministries. I still encourage young

men to embrace the priesthood. I do not know if the form will change in any of the kinds of ways that are addressed so often in the media, but I do know one thing, we need to be attuned to *how* the Spirit, who is alive in our country, is beckoning us in the New Epoch of World Church.

# **The Roman Catholic Chaplain in the Third Christian Epoch: A Response**

**Chaplain (LTC) Cecil D. Lewis**

Prior to my service as an Army Chaplain, I had very limited contacts with Roman Catholic priests. They served in their parishes among their people and I did the same in my own area. This changed when I became an Army Chaplain. Since that time when continuing shortage of priests has been perplexing to me.

It is not my responsibility to speak about the reasons why there are fewer young men entering the priesthood, and am I thankful for that! I agree, though, that this is a key issue.

Nothing could be more frustrating for a successful industrialist whose factory and businesses are flourishing, than to learn that none of his five sons wants to accept a position of responsibility as the new vice-president, or even president of the company. Even though the sons enjoy the atmosphere and fellowship of the factory, they choose to run a punch press or to drive a fork truck. To others in the factory it may seem strange that they are not interested in becoming a vice-president or even president. Since it is a family affair, however, no one has too much to say at least not publicly. Everyone has his own ideas as to "why," but in the final analysis simply agrees that it is not their business. Now every analogy will break down at some point; please don't push mine too far.

Chaplain Ennis stated that his first goal was "to address the emphasis of the Roman Catholic Chaplain's ministry in a pluralistic Army." One of my chaplain-friends, now retired, advised me that I would find myself identifying closer with Catholic Chaplains on some theological issues than



Chaplain Lewis is endorsed by the General Association of Regular Baptists. His assignments include the US Army Chaplain School and the US Army Chaplain Board. He recently returned from Korea, where he served as Division Chaplain for the Second Infantry Division. He currently serves as Administrative Staff Chaplain at Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri.

some of my Protestant Chaplain peers. At that time I did not understand what he meant. I soon learned that he was correct. During my early years in the Army, several of us became involved in a discussion about the virgin birth of Christ. It was evident that the two priests and I were defending that position, while a couple of the Protestant Chaplains could not agree. From the beginning it has been clear that the vast majority of Roman Catholic priests were dedicated to faithfully representing their church and serving a pastoral role in the military. To chaplains of other denominations I have urged at times that the only reason we are in the Army is to serve as pastors—as clergy representing our various church denominations.

In the following paragraphs Chaplain Ennis described “the Catholic Chaplain...as a channel of resources.” This idea can easily evoke spirited discussions among us. Some older Catholic Chaplains have taken the position that Roman Catholic priests have no business getting involved in “administrative, paper-work jobs” but must spend their time in pastoral responsibilities only. Others point to the manner in which civilian Roman Catholic priests serve in all types of positions and are sometimes frustrated and perhaps embarrassed by their fellow priests. It will not be surprising for me candidly to state that non-Roman Catholic Chaplains are often unhappy when asked to carry additional responsibilities because a priest either refuses to perform such tasks or, if required to do so, will not perform them acceptably.

The definition of “channel of resources” according to Chaplain Ennis includes planning, programming, and budgeting. He further identifies a need to train lay leaders for the community. This point brings me back to earlier comments about the strong Roman Catholic lay leaders presently in Army chapels. In opening remarks, Chaplain Ennis spoke of the critical shortage of priests, but then emphasized the increasing role of strong lay leaders. This is true. There is a large number of Roman Catholic lay leaders in our Army chapels, both enlisted and officer, but I want to point out that most of these people were educated and trained in pre-Vatican II days. Most of these are the products of Catholic schools where education was traditional, and discipline was thorough. It is natural for most of these people to follow the lead of the pastor/chaplain and to be faithful. The belief that lay leaders will serve to enlarge and support the ministry within the Roman Catholic community assumes they are *now* receiving quality education and training in the home, in the school, and in Army chapels! If your answer is that education and training are just as good now, then tomorrow will take care of itself. To examine this assumption, look at the level of commitment among the young E-4's, E-5's, Lieutenants, and Captains in your Catholic community. There may also be some basis for concern in the light of the decline in the number of seminarians during the past ten to fifteen years.

This may sound as if I am disagreeing with the presenter, but just the opposite is true. I also believe that lay leaders must provide leadership within the Roman Catholic community in the future. No doubt I am

reflecting on my own experiences during the past few years, when I was concerned about the need for Roman Catholic priests to encourage lay members to take more leadership in chapel programs. I have been heavily involved in the theories and application of parish development which simply is "planning, programming, budgeting, and the use of lay leaders" in Army chapels. Reaction to my efforts in this area by other Army chaplains has been mixed. Some have applied these principles, while others have ignored the entire process.

From my experience on the Army Chaplain Board I can verify the fact that many of your Roman Catholic parishes are filled with new, innovative, practical programs. During my time there I worked with Chaplain Tom Confroy in obtaining samples from all over the country. I visited the Office of Pastoral Planning on several occasions and thereby learned there is a great deal of expertise available. The Roman Catholic Army Chaplain must be willing to use it.

During my recent tour of duty in Korea as the Second Infantry Division Chaplain, the senior priest (Chaplain Bob Berger) and I agreed on a simple experiment. With the heavy emphasis on "Team Spirit '83," all of the Catholic priests were scheduled to accompany their units from the Camp Casey-Hovey area. Our plan was to arrange for lay leaders to provide coverage over the ten or twelve day period of the exercise. The local civilian priest was available for emergencies. Soldiers who remained in the area attended these services and had strong, positive feelings about them. A couple of them confided that they felt the services were as great a blessing to them as their regular priest-led services. They then quickly added, "We do need a priest."

There were two things I learned from this. First, when the priest encouraged and assisted the lay members of the congregation, they performed exceptionally well. Second, I learned that the opposite is also true. One of the priests travelled back for his service, a drive of five hours each direction! When I asked him why he did this, his response indicated that he did not understand the program.

In responding to the subject of lay leaders, I have actually proceeded to Chaplain Ennis's second goal, "the discovery and utilization of the available resources for ministry."

To say that a right attitude is essential for success is akin to stating that to win a foot race one must run. The attitude of two of those three division priests was positive toward trusting lay leaders. I am not certain about the third one. Attitude is most critical.

The other essential element mentioned by Chaplain Ennis is education. Without getting into a battle of semantics, I will assume that this term is broad and includes what many of us refer to as "training." There is little doubt in my mind that the chaplaincy offers the best training anywhere for clergy. Our present Chief of Chaplains is committed to Chaplain Professional Development. This leads me to believe then, Chaplain Ennis, that we're back to "attitude." And I'm convinced that most of us do what we

want to do. If a chaplain, whether Roman Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish, wants to obtain ideas about training and using lay leaders in chapel, he or she can find the material and the training necessary to do it.

Because I want you to remember this part longer than that which I have stated personally, I hasten to point out that the scriptures have a great deal to say on this subject. Jesus himself told his disciples: "Therefore go and make disciples in all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and then teach these new disciples to obey all the commands I have given you: and be sure of this—that I am with you always even to the end of the World." (Matthew 28:19-20, *The Living Bible*).

And to young Timothy the Apostle Paul exhorted, "Timothy, my dear son, may you be strong with the strength Christ Jesus gives you. For you must teach others those things you and many others have heard me speak about. Teach these great truths to trustworthy men who will, in turn, pass them on to others." (Timothy 2:1-2, *The Living Bible*)

# **Serpents, Doves and Swords: The Wise Man as a Model for Ministry in the Military Chaplaincy**

**Chaplain (CPT) Fred L. Downing**

*"Behold, I send you out as sheep in the midst of wolves; so be wise as serpents and innocent as doves."<sup>1</sup>*

Some years ago, when visiting a work site during an Annual Training period, I was met with this penetrating question: "What is a fellow like you doing in an outfit like this?" I think that question has remained active in my mind because in some way the young soldier summarized in a few words that I had known for a long time was something of a basic problem. Indeed what was I doing there?

What follows is something of a partial answer to that question. This could be seen as a personal or autobiographical statement and I am sure that to some extent it is. But I think that what follows also has some claim to reflection and objectivity and may well describe the situation as many of us have perceived it. Hence I share it in an effort to stimulate thought about a difficult but significant problem.

Every professional group must have some form of self-identity. The lack of such professional self-identity has long been recognized as a problem for the clergy in the modern era. This is particularly true for the chaplain in the military. The chaplain is an officer without command authority and consequently, he is often considered something of a "5th

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 10:16



Chaplain Downing is a Southern Baptist minister, presently serving as the chaplain for the 165th Transportation Battalion of the Louisiana National Guard. He is an Associate Professor of Religion at Louisiana College in Pineville, Louisiana.

wheel" which has obvious connotations for the individual chaplain's self-esteem and job satisfaction.<sup>2</sup>

This problem is intensified in the military because of two factors. The chaplain has a mission which stands in tension with military objectives. In addition the historic religious pluralism of the chaplaincy has complicated the problem of self-identity by restricting such factors as common cultural or denominational background, the number of common symbols and models. Both of these factors have possibilities for constriction as well as freedom for the military chaplaincy.

## A Model

What I am proposing in this article is that the Wisdom traditions of ancient Israel, which are common to the faiths of Protestants, Catholic and Jews, contain an untapped resource for reflection on the role of the chaplain in the military. The wise man of this tradition can be seen as something of a role model for the contemporary chaplain with special relevance for chaplain/commander and staff relationships. This is, of course, not to say that it is the only appropriate one. Traditional models for ministry such as priest and prophet will still be required and certainly helpful to the overall function of the chaplain. However, the chaplain may find the model of the wise man to be more comprehensive and all encompassing especially when one seeks an answer to the question, "What is a fellow like you doing in an outfit like this?"

Walter Brueggemann suggests that "the model of wise man is appropriate in a cultural situation where the normally felt needs are not felt: a situation of relative health (in which forgiveness by God and reconciliation to God seem unimportant); a situation of confidence (in which transcendence, guidance, and assurance seem irrelevant); a situation of power (in which the king is able to cope, and chaos seems no pressing threat)."<sup>3</sup> In suggesting the wise man as a model for ministry, Brueggemann also indicates that he is suggesting a certain context of ministry: "The wise man is the one with the finesse and shrewdness to put the question of meaning in ways that do not irritate the king. He is equipped to make observations out of experience so that the king must share the insight as his own. The wise man serves to help persons of power probe the options and explore the limits beyond which our power brings death rather than

<sup>2</sup>See especially David B. Sabine, "The Fifth Wheel: The troubled origins of the chaplaincy," *Civil War Times Illustrated* Vol. XIX, No. 2 (May, 1980): 14-23.

<sup>3</sup>Walter Brueggeman, *In Man We Trust: The Neglected Side of Biblical Faith* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1972) 110. In this article I have drawn heavily from Brueggemann's assessment of the wise man as a model for ministry. While working through the above cited work, I became convinced that this model of ministry was particularly relevant to the work of the chaplaincy. Thus a partial motivation for this present effort comes out of this particular realization and the idea that as chaplains, we need to be about the business of thinking of our ministry in theological terms and models.

life.”<sup>4</sup> This was the original context for the ministry of the wise man. “In Israel, wise men functioned persistently and precariously in the places where decisions are made which mobilize great power in far-reaching ways.”<sup>5</sup> I would suggest that Brueggemann’s concept of the wise man as a model for ministry is no where more relevant in the modern era than in the military. No doubt, the model has been lived out by many insightful chaplains perhaps without the reflective awareness that this was indeed the model by which they were acting. But could not this understanding of ministry be taught through the use of the wise man as a model? The first step is to begin to investigate the context of the original model and movement.

## The Context for Ministry

It is commonly understood that the wisdom tradition in ancient Israel had its origins in the early years of the Davidic/Solomonic monarchy. This was a period that was much like the contemporary era. With the growth and development of the monarchy, Israel was confronted with an international way of life. Solomon’s goal was to make Israel a cosmopolitan center. The faithful in Israel struggled with the problem of cultural and religious pluralism which came with the onset of this larger world. In this context older Mosaic faith was called into question and was rejected by many. The wisdom tradition came to full flower in Israel as an effort to reformulate old faith in light of “a world come of age.”<sup>6</sup>

The time prior to David is seen as a world where the ordering of Israel’s life is amphictyonic and Mosaic. This was a world of local folk cultures, primarily rural and tribally-oriented. This conventional time was apparently characterized by traditional and authoritative forms of religion. The initial struggle between the new emerging order of the monarchy and the older theocracy is seen most clearly in the clash between Saul and Samuel. Though Samuel “anoints” Saul as the first king, the prophet later announced that God has rejected Saul as king. Saul dies the death of a ruler who has lost the authenticating and legitimatizing forces that religion can give. The power of the theocratic institutions of the tribal era is still very much evident here. For a time Israel continued with the characteristics of this older order: subsistence economics, tribal religion, and the political tradition of the local charismatic leader/judge.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., 111.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>See Walter Brueggemann, Supplementary Volume *IDB*: 972-974. See also E.W. Heaton, *The Hebrew Kingdoms* (London: Oxford University Press, 1968) 51. In addition, see Fred L. Downing, “Worship in Ancient Israel: Some Normative Traditions,” *The Theological Educator* Vol. XI, No. 2 (Spring, 1982): 44-52.

<sup>7</sup>This conventional time in Israel’s history is portrayed with graphic description in the biblical books of Judges and 1 Samuel.

## A New Age

An obvious change comes with David.<sup>8</sup> He makes an extreme effort to establish continuity with the past. But the monarch is a radical innovation and it brings a new theology. The innovation that David brings is essentially a positive appreciation of syncretism.<sup>9</sup> Because of David, Israel enters a new era. This was an age of new possibilities, questions, and dilemmas.

This new age was brought on primarily because of David's power and military genius. Under the new king, Israel reached a new level of influence and sophistication. The newness touched every area of existence. Militarily, David and his personal army defeated the old enemies and expanded the borders of the state in rapid fashion. Economically, the continued control of trade routes brought Israel into a time of affluence that she had not known before. Politically, Israel was not involved in a new international venture. The folkways with its parochial vision were replaced with international politics.<sup>10</sup>

This new cosmopolitan effort absorbed new groups and for the first time Israel struggled with the twin problems of cultural and religious pluralism. The new power generated by David brought to Israel greater influence and sophistication as well as new opportunities for leisure and reflection. The older ways of reflection on life which were largely theocentric were now challenged by a more humanistic approach to life. The power and success of David gave new confidence to what could be hoped and imagined. Because of the ensuing intellectual and literary development, the German scholar, Gerhard von Rad has called this the age of Israel's enlightenment.<sup>11</sup>

When compared to Israel's earlier tribal and theocentric approach to life, the prevailing spirit of the monarchy was much more secular, humanistic and pluralistic. Breuggemann summarizes the developing

<sup>8</sup>This obvious change is described by Breuggemann, *In Man We Trust*, 29ff. For the significance of this change described from a different perspective. See George E. Mendenhall, *The Tenth Generation: The Origins of the Biblical Tradition* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973) and Mendenhall, "The Monarchy" *Interpretation* Vol. XXIX, No. 2 (April, 1975) 155-170.

<sup>9</sup>Breuggemann, *In Man We Trust*, 31. For a full treatment of this idea, see Murray L. Newman, Jr., *The People of the Covenant* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), 160 ff. Also Fred L. Downing "Theological Concepts Concerning Jerusalem in Isaiah 1-39," An unpublished Th. D. dissertation, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1976. Newman thinks that when David transferred the ark to Jerusalem and placed it in the tent of meeting (II Samuel 6) David created a new theology involving the combination of northern and southern traditions as well as the transfer of the center of covenant theology from a priestly dynasty to a royal dynasty. Abiathar, the priest from Shiloh, and the ark were associated with the northern tradition. Nathan, a priest from Hebron, along with the tent of meeting were originally a part of the southern tradition. Some scholars suggest that Zadok was a former Jebusite priest in the pre-Davidic Jerusalem shrine who was not incorporated into David's new coalition.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid.

<sup>11</sup>Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology* Vol. I (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), 48-56. See also von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1972) 82ff. See especially p. 97.

situation in this way: "Israel for the first time struggled with the problem of cultural and religious pluralism in which the conventional answers of the Mosaic tradition no longer could be taken at face value. . . . New kinds of questions were being posed which Israel in its earlier, more precarious existence had not had time or inclination to ask. The point of reference for meaning in history was shifting. No longer could the complexities of faith and culture be resolved or accepted in terms of Israel's older institutions. Now the point of reference was the other nations, the more prosperous cultures, the more impressive centers of power and learning."<sup>12</sup>

Brueggemann suggests that in such a cultural crisis there are three options for the people of faith: (1) simply repeat the old tradition; (2) abandon the old tradition; (3) work out a radical reformulation of the old tradition with reference to the new situation.<sup>13</sup>

The progressives of 10th century Israel attempted to live as men of faith in the midst of secularization and to minister in that context. In the minds of these 10th century theologians, David is considered the prototype for a new reality, a new lifestyle, a clear knowledge of what it means to be human. When the conventional patterns and answers no longer work, the progressives attempted to describe the possible alternatives which they saw embodied in David—a different kind of man who celebrated life and lived with a new vision of freedom, responsibility and risk.<sup>14</sup>

## Ties With the Past

The 20th century A.D. has much in common with the 10th century B.C. We too have seen a movement away from rural, tribal-oriented living. We too live in a post-traditional society where the village has become the world.<sup>15</sup> The internationalism of David/Solomon is now commonplace around the world. Likewise as in the 10th century a new power has arisen with its relativizing tendencies for the global village. While the 20th century has witnessed as never before the effort to wage a war to end all wars, the swords have not been beaten into plowshares. Instead the nuclear threat looms so heavily on the horizon of the global village that we now know more surely than ever before that the destiny of our world is in the hands of man. The old theocratic ways of reflecting on life which were common in our more traditional society have disappeared for many of the inhabitants of the global village.<sup>16</sup> Most importantly for our study, those

<sup>12</sup>Brueggemann, *In Man We Trust*, 48.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., 49.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., 33.

<sup>15</sup>For a sociological analysis of the 20th century as a post-traditional society, see especially Robert N. Bellah, *Beyond Belief: Essays on Religion in a Post-Traditional World* (New York: Harper & Row, 1970) and Peter L. Berger, *A Rumor of Angels: Modern Society and the Rediscovery of the Supernatural* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1969).

<sup>16</sup>Ibid.

who know this reality best are probably soldiers in some king's army. These soldiers know through their own personal experience in combat training and simulated conditions, if not in real battle field conditions, that the power to control the destiny of the world is in the hands of men and not the hands of traditional deity. World Wars I & II, the ensuing cold war, and the Vietnam war—these experiences have likely destroyed the possibilities of a theocratic order forever. In reflecting on the impact of the Jewish holocaust of World War II, Richard Rubenstein concludes that it no longer makes sense to use theistic terms to express the human situation or to speak of a God who in any way governs history. Rubenstein's conclusion is that man is alone in the global village which in his opinion has turned into a jungle where the law is now the survival of the fittest.<sup>17</sup>

## The Chaplain As A Wiseman

How does one minister in such a context? When the old orders of life seem to be broken, how does one reflect on God or speak effectively of God? In such a context the wisdom tradition of ancient Israel grew and developed in the 10th century B.C. and in such a context military chaplains have lived and worked for many years of this 20th century. One thing seems clear from such a context, there is no longer a *deus ex machina*. Man must find his own answers. In such a context the wisdom teachers focused on life and death talk. There was less talk about God than before. When theological language was employed, it was not prophetic. On the surface the language of the wisdom traditions conceals the urgency of the message which it attempts to couch in more subtle terms. This was an effort to discuss the ultimate realities of a world come of age: life and death. Brueggemann suggests that the Book of Proverbs indicates two major theological precepts for the wise man: decisions matter in terms of one's destiny and one had better heed the choices he makes; there is a givenness about life with which one cannot tamper despite all the power and influence of the present situation.<sup>18</sup> These precepts are used by the wiseman in several ways.

Basic to the work of the wise man is the choice of the model of his ministry in any given context in response to the perceived need for perspective. When the wise man sees that he is in a situation where power and authority issues prevent the felt need for forgiveness (the priestly role) or the need for transcendence (the prophetic role) then "the wise man serves to help persons of power probe the options and explore the limits of power beyond... which power brings death rather than life."<sup>19</sup> In this regard the ministry of the wise man is thoroughly contextual.

<sup>17</sup>Richard L. Rubenstein, *After Auschwitz: Radical Theology and Contemporary Judaism* (New York: The Bobbs Merrill Company, Inc., 1966) 216.

<sup>18</sup>Brueggemann, *In Man We Trust*, 52.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., 111.

In the context described above the wisdom theologians of the 10th century B.C. in Israel demonstrated that the ministry of insight and finesse takes on new value. The wisdom writers began to realize that the threats of the prophetic tradition would only bring more alienation. Moralistic scolding would only disallow any further opportunity. Hence the method of ministry for this context became by necessity more rationalistic and utilitarian. Just as the chaplain realizes he is an officer without command authority so the wise man made no claim to transcendent authority. Thus the context that demands the model of the wise man also dictates that the authority of ministry must emerge from below rather than above. The type of authority here is strictly functional in nature as opposed to a hierarchical structure.<sup>20</sup> The authority for this type ministry must therefore be discerned from the common experience of life. The validity for this form of ministry (or any form!) is that life is this way. Hence the most important realities for the ministry of the wise man will always be life and death.

This is a type of ministry which must be carried out largely without symbolic sanction. This is not a ministry whose symbolic power may rest in an institution as in the priestly or prophetic models whose power relate to synagogue and church. Rather in this case the symbolic power rests with the king or governmental leader. There is no ritual which the wise man can regularly perform. Therefore the wise man must be “content with an apparently modest but most crucial role: enlarging the vision out of which the king makes his choices, thus opting for the life or death of the whole society.”<sup>21</sup> Though the chaplain is something of a denominational representative and often performs in priestly and prophetic roles, he functions in these roles largely without the symbolic power of the church. Indeed a “chapel” is not a church and is prevented from being one by law. Furthermore much counseling (the priestly role) takes place outside of the symbolic structure of the chapel, on work sites or battle fields. Many chaplains must work in the context where their job descriptions are far from clear, which only further suggests that the chaplain usually is deprived in some way of a professional self-identity and must work largely without symbolic or institutional sanction.

## Ministry at the Margin

Thus the ministry of the wise man and that of the chaplain is essentially “ministry at the margin.”<sup>22</sup> They both live in a pluralistic situation where questions of value and meaning are largely unsettled. The traditional ministerial self-images and self-presentations are ineffective here. Likewise the characteristic concerns of the church are not all-consuming here. The

<sup>20</sup>Ibid.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., 112.

conventional church activities are not at the center of concern for this model. Rather the major issues of concern for the wise man are power, justice, security, and order. These issues are not settled in the church but in a secular society where the wise man attempts entry with talk that will make sense and get a hearing in that context.

This model is not in opposition to other models or more traditional forms. The theology behind this model affirms the appropriateness of drawing from all kinds of sources and skills including what some would label as the more secular disciplines. The ministry of the wise man would not criticize preaching and counseling (prophetic and priestly roles) but would affirm them and also draw from such unusual ministerial skills as program development and conflict analysis.<sup>23</sup>

This type of model will raise questions for some about its appropriateness for ministry just as the ministry of the chaplaincy brings many questions to some of us. Some may want to ask "Is this model biblical?" The answer is yes, of course! The model itself is almost three thousand years old. It is unfortunately located in one of the more neglected traditions of the biblical faith and therefore something of a minority report. Perhaps that is appropriate for a model of ministry which functions at the margin. Others will want to know if this model is exclusivistic. Does it exclude the other models as illegitimate? Here the wise man would say, no! The wise man would encourage a deeper understanding of these words "...the torah shall not perish from the priest, nor counsel from the wise, nor the word from the prophet."<sup>24</sup> For the wise man the key is to choose the appropriate model for the appropriate context. In so doing the wise man helps us to choose life? The teacher from Nazareth left us with this charge; "Behold, I send you out as sheep in the midst of wolves; so be wise as serpents and innocent as doves."<sup>25</sup>

<sup>23</sup>ibid., 113.

<sup>24</sup>Jeremiah 18:18

<sup>25</sup>Matthew 10:16

# The Chaplain: Prophet, Jester, or Jerk

The Reverend Thomas A. Harris

"Like the jester, Christ defies custom and scorns crowned heads."

How often do you find the title *chaplain* spelled without the second *a* so that it reads *chaplin*? I wonder if this is really an error; perhaps it is a cosmic Freudian slip. Maybe we ought to be more like that partly pathetic, partly triumphant figure which Charlie Chaplin created early in the century—the little tramp who, though victimized by society, somehow always managed to point up the absurdity of the "ins." Somehow the figure created by Chaplin often tended to get hold of the right end of the stick—which, by the way, is a comment made about Christ by another jester of our time, namely, George Bernard Shaw.

The title *chaplain* began with Martin of Tours, a fourth century Saint. Legend says that Martin shared his cloak with a beggar, keeping the smallest part for himself. Thus the little "cape" or *capella*. The *capella* became a relic; its custodian became the *capellanus*, and eventually, the chaplain.

## The Chaplain as a Jerk

One of the main pictures that the mind conjures up of the chaplain through the ages is that he is the property of the prince, the flunky of the Lord, a part of the impedimenta of the Army. He has existed to praise the prince and to urge him to pour it on the peasants. He has been quick to find reasons to reinforce the status quo and to add emotional intensification to the position of the powerful. The need to keep things as they are at all costs

This article is reprinted from the *Military Chaplains' Review*, Volume 1, No. 3, August 1972.

The Reverend Harris retired from the Army Chaplaincy in July 1972 with the rank of Colonel. His last assignment on active duty was as Staff Chaplain to the Surgeon General in Washington, DC. He is served for several years as Associate Director of the Episcopalian Pastoral Center for the Diocese of Dallas. He currently serves as Association Pastor of Trinity Episcopal Church in Fort Worth and as Consultant for the Clergy Intern Program for Central and North Texas of the Methodist Church.

has seemed to motivate this priestly functionary. He has blessed the actions of the nobles and preserved his warm place by the fire. Pretending to be morally, ethically, and spiritually dedicated, he has worked to reassure the conscience of his employer. One stereotype that the chaplain has attained, therefore, is that of the castrated flunky of the court.

I do not like the title *chaplain*, nor am I at all sure that I wish to continue under such a banner. You may tell me that the above picture is an extreme one, but I know that it persists as one of the popular, recurring reactions to the term *chaplain*. I think we have done much to perpetuate the view by some of our deeds, both conscious and unconscious. The hospital chaplain, for example, often finds himself supporting the myths of the medical profession. Too often he cooperates in maintaining the fantasy of the physician as a flawless magician who, if obeyed, can guarantee health. Another example is the way the chaplain encourages patients to express to him hostile feelings which they hold toward the physician or the nurse, thus subtracting from their need to take any further action through law, outside influence, or confrontation. By so doing, chaplains also make it easier for the physician to continue in his unreal view of himself, and take from him the need to admit and deal with understandable human errors. The chaplain may talk in terms of lowering anxiety levels and may demonstrate in case conference after case conference how well ventilation works and how much his people need a chance to express their negative feelings to one who accepts, but one of the main effects he causes is that of destroying any drive to change the situation. This is regrettable, for the patient's reaction may have been a valid response to a blunder by the physician or to an obstinate refusal by the physician to deal with his patients as human beings.

On the institutional level hospital chaplains tend to assume too often that the "given" is the "right," that the institution works in the best possible manner and must be supported. We chaplains draw our sustenance from the administrative policies of the hospitals and we work there by permission of the physicians who must, therefore, be right. If our tenure has been long and our salaries and status have grown, there is even more reason to accept the divine right of the status quo. We may know that the method of making medical care available (the health service's delivery system) is complex and antiquated, having been super-imposed on the basic confusion of the past, but we don't fight it. We may know that the cost of care to the patient has grown astronomically not only because of new, expensive equipment, highly specialized care, and growing labor costs, but also because of lack of planning. Yet we offer no objection. We have our lockers in the clubhouse of doctors and are afraid we might lose our club rights if we complain.

In correctional institutions, chaplains may be serving as custodians in a school for crime, but their fears of both the inmates and the staff and their identification with the State can blind them to courses of action that might help change the system to one in which rehabilitation is possible. In

addition, prison chaplains may fear what might happen to them if their aggressive drives were allowed to go unchecked. The prison riot may be an enlarged photograph of what they fear might happen to them if the State does not systematically and punitively arrange for the restriction of offenders. In macrocosm in the prison, they may see themselves in terms of their own need for shackles. They therefore jump when they are told and they justify their actions rationally, intellectually, logically—beautifully.

In the military setting the game is also played effectively. Because of my many years in the military, I am more sensitive to that situation. I know that most of us deny our identification with the military system, certainly with the use of military force as a means of handling international differences. We tend to say that we are in the system simply because it exists as an arm of society and the people who do society's dirty work for it must be served. Or we subtly identify with the best of the system and point out that many military people serve only because their culture wants them to, and thus the evil is in the total culture as well as in the military. We may say we minister to the military even as civilian clergy minister to a sinful total society. The only way out is to resign from the human race. This is one of my rationalizations. But is it true? As a human being, I too am an intellectual gymnast. I can fake myself out beautifully. The fact that I draw a large salary and struggle to find ways to make others believe in the basic chivalry of the military is often all too clear to me. And I often serve the system rather effectively, I think. Nonetheless, when I set out to provide ways for people to live in a more human way in the system, I thereby help to perpetuate that system.

I am sure that these charges hold as well for the industrial chaplain, who works with a confused and intricate economy to assist people so that they can be relied upon in the work force. This identifies him with you and me as part of the problem. The chaplain to the tobacco industry in the South must find ways to vindicate his work. We are human and we are self-centered; it is difficult for us to see what we don't want to see. Or worse, if we do see it, we know how to explain or mitigate it for a time.

I know that many of us rise far above the negative, foolish picture I have painted. I agree that many of our defenses are based on truth. But I am sure you and I need no help in our defensiveness. None of that does away with the danger which I am asking us to face. We as "chaplains" can too easily become more like puppets on a string than like people of freedom and responsibility. When a puppet has its strings pulled it tends to jerk. Do you remember the film *Parable* in which living marionettes were jerked and controlled by the owner of the circus, Magnus the Great, who with his evil fellows later jerked, controlled and killed the clown? You can understand the world *jerk* in the title of this paper in either the slang meaning of an unworthy clod who is less than human or you can picture in your mind the puppet on a string. Both, unfortunately, are elements in the chaplaincy of most of us. We are indeed, all too often, jerks.

What intensifies the situation is that unlike most puppets chaplains

are able to figure out ahead of time who is going to pull the strings and in what manner, so that they can make the movements appear to be *natural* and *smooth*. The better trained the chaplain is the easier it is for him to accomplish this feat. In addition, the really effective chaplain knows how to get other people to move when the strings are pulled. At times they even help the puppeteer to tie others on his strings. Whether they do so by churchly ministrations or by subtle or not so subtle, directive or nondirective counseling, is unimportant. Chaplains are jerks and they want others to jerk with them when the strings are pulled. They can even write the script for the string pullers and lay themselves and others out to be attached to the strings. This is called "clinical pastoral education" and, at its worst, it is often most effective.

## The Chaplain as Prophet and Priest

By now I hope you are angry. Possibly you are not; you may have simply sloughed off this entire approach as overdone and thus as unworthy of further consideration. If so, you merely confirm my argument. You are a *happy* puppet and *enjoy* being manipulated. Most of us, however, cannot be happy living as puppets. Realizing that we have drifted more and more into the trap, we flail about for a way out. We sincerely prefer to sing with Pinnochio, "I've got no strings to hold me up." So what do many of us do? We react by reaffirming our "religious" function. Don't forget that one of the wrong, but common, functions of "religion" is to attempt to manipulate God—to get Him on our strings. This type of "religious" reaction is really not much better than the reflexive jerk of the marionette.

If we emphasize the "prophetic" approach in our reaction, we are likely to talk very spiritedly about putting tension on an evil culture. We begin, as the prophets did, to "speak for God." The danger in speaking for God is that before long we have God speaking for us. We are like the clergyman I know who does not preach, "Why can't you be like Jesus, I am," but rather preaches, "Why can't you be like me, Jesus was." It is simple. We decide to discern God's will and serve Him perfectly. We spend time in the seminary and on our own in striving to find God's word for today and in rightly setting forth the doctrine. Well, since God is a pretty decent sort, surely He will show us His will if we do our part. We, therefore, study, work, reflect and meditate, after which everything becomes clear. What has happened is that we have subtly substituted our will for God's will. Our *whims* have become God's *will*. When people differ with us, we respond with great fervor because it is not simply our human argument but, above all, God's will which is being contested. This is the time to bristle. The prophetic stance changes from speaking for God to fighting for Him. Under what we call the guidance of Heaven we become as uncooperative as Hell.

The result of all of this is that we refuse to join any team unless we are allowed to carry the ball all the time. Our institutions—whether medical,

industrial, correctional, military, or collegiate will find that they cannot get along with us and thus they may decide not to let us continue to serve from within. Our potential usefulness will be lost.

Another stance of the prophet is that of personal self-righteousness and/or judgmental piety. As perfectionists we can brook no failures on the part of the people we are supposed to serve. We think we are marching with Glasser, Mowrer and others into the arena of freedom and responsibility. We confront our people with their failures in such a way that they can only reject us if they have anything of worth within them. We moralize, using our sophisticated training to justify our actions. We reject, calling it confrontation. We refer to our patronizations as an honest self-congruent recognition of our true values as compared to the clear-cut nonvalues of our people, who do not measure up to our standards. We see them as worthless puppets flopping about awkwardly on their strings. Like Elijah of old we have a victory or two, and then, because the whole world does not go our way, we enjoy the self-pity that is the delectable satisfaction of the righteously lonely. We run from God lest He show us the 7,000 others who see even more clearly than we do the true purposes of God.

As prophets we tend to draw the line between ourselves and our culture; we measure our greatness in terms of our quite natural rejection by our institutions and by our peers. There is no one so lonely as the man who is using loneliness to prove just how righteous he is. Like some of the prophets of old, we oversimplify so beautifully that the clear truths we stand behind actually becomes lies. Back, we cry, to the good old days of the desert and away from the fertility rites of the agricultural society—to say nothing of the fleshpots of the city! But there is no way back. The true prophet can only be discerned as the obscuring stones are removed one by one from his dead body. What remains may have been holy, but it was also something less than human.

Another of the “religious” reactions to the danger of puppetry is the way of the priest. Here God is the divine puppet and the strings we have Him on are the strings of doctrine, of sacrament, and of other forms of worship. If we can purify ourselves ritually and ceremonially and revise our liturgies in the direction of God’s truth, then we can serve men by “re-presenting” God to them. We can, as the military chaplain cliché states it, “Bring God to man and man to God.” By preparing properly and by repeating the right words and actions in a proper sequence, we can surely force God to be good on our terms. We can also feel better within. So the chaplain withdraws from confronting people or institutions and steps up his activities in dispensing the sacraments and in peddling piety to the simple people of the larger or smaller parish. There is no way out of this trap through simply revising the liturgy and experimenting in new activities in worship. (To me it seems impossible to conceive of “experimental” worship any more than “experimental” sexual relations. One either worships or he doesn’t.) For what we are saying in seeking for new formulae is simply that the old approach was right but the words and actions were

wrong. We play the same music but change the steps of the dance.

It is also the priest who is the teacher of doctrine, the purveyor of a rational and historical system of concepts about life, certified by God. This too fails for the chaplain, because the problems we work with seem to have no answers. Or maybe our answers are like that of Sri Ramikrishna in response to the questions of one who wanted to know why, if God was both good and powerful, He could allow evil and suffering. To this Ramikrishna is supposed to have said. "To thicken the plot."<sup>3</sup> Perhaps Albert Schweitzer was closer to our needs when he observed that having answers tends to deaden compassion by just that much. If I know why you suffer, then I am less concerned with your suffering.

This has all been foreshortened but there has been enough said to point up the problem of the chaplain who runs toward "religion," whether into prophecy or priestliness, to escape from the threat of being forever a puppet on a string. There is much error mixed with the truth, but there is enough truth, I hope, to sting a little.

Where does that leave us? Who could doubt from the title and length of this article that we must now be close to the answer. But the answer of the "jester" is only an answer in the sense that it denies that easier answer of the puppet and the prophet. It is really not an answer; it is a recognition that being human is more important than having answers.

## The Chaplain as Jester

Since I began historically with the stereotype of the chaplain as a feeble, foolish functionary, perhaps it is in order to take up the term *jester* from the same approach. The jester was the one man in the court who could stand up to the prince, or the baron, or the man of wealth. Because of this he was the one person who had a chance of doing the humanizing thing. It was his job to stick pins into pretentious people, to point up the errors of his master, to expose callous policies as evil. It was his job to be the representative of the rest of us in the court of the king. If the peasant had a chance to get the aristocrat off his back, it was because the "fool" showed the ruler how foolish his wisdom really was. The jester was the humanizer, the enabler, and, yes, even the "en-nobler." True, he had to take great care how he went about it. He had to hide the thrust of his statement in a joke or a jest or a silly song, but that was the mark of his worth as a jester. He had to find the way to get the king to let up. If he failed, the people had little recourse. He had to learn the truth of the ancient saying that "he who brings bad tidings to the king should have one foot in the stirrup." The scriptural injunction most to the point for the jester is that which points up the need to be as wise as serpents and harmless as doves (Matthew 10:16).

The pitfalls and pratfalls of the jester were the risks of his trade. They were the recognized occupational hazards. It was indeed a difficult role and I suppose many failed, and their heads—cap and bells and

<sup>3</sup>John Cage, *Silence* (Wesleyan Press, 1961) p. 63.

all—rolled into an obscure corner of the banquet hall; nevertheless, let us hope, many succeeded.

There is a bit of the prophet in the jester as well. Remember the story of the prophet Nathan who branded David with "Thou Art the Man," after telling a seemingly nonthreatening story about an injustice done to a poor farmer by a wealthy man? With David the story had an effect. Today one wonders if Nathan would have been so successful. It appears that the kings of old (at least some of them) had brains enough to keep their jesters to make sure their royal feet would be held to the fire of humanity. How easy it is to believe in our importance if no one gives us feedback! How many times have we run our chaplain programs somewhere off by ourselves with a little circle of sanctimonious followers cloaking our idiocy from others, and thus from ourselves? It is not easy to have the import of our actions held up before us, because sooner or later we are going to be shown to be wrong. Such an exposure is unsettling because we either have to revise our own self-image downward or we have to do something about it. (It should also be said that there is something of the priest in the jester as well. He does, in fact, represent us before God.)

In our present culture it is less and less possible to find a true court jester. If he is a true jester he is *persona non grata* at court. It is only when we are honestly trying to improve that we can stand having our policies held up to ridicule. There must be strength if we are to permit irony or sarcasm to exist. Humor cuts through inadequacies in such a way that they cannot be hidden. Today we have many wisecrackers but few, if any, humorists. Where is the Will Rogers of our day? The warm, salty humor of Rogers came from pointing up the human inadequacies of a Congress and a nation neither of which had overly inflated views of their self-importance. (The wisecracks of a Bob Hope are quite another thing—they are the harmless pebbles thrown by a small boy rather than the well-aimed, but deadly stones hurled by a David.) Today the climate is not favorable for jesters either in court or out of court. The foolish and destructive actions of the young rebels in our society leave no room for humor. No one is as puffed up and vain as many of the young, self-styled, generation-gap revolutionaries of our day.

Maybe it is not all that dark. I do not want to fall into the error of the prophet, but I think there is some truth in my argument.

Let's get out of the halls of State and over into our own bailiwicks. In our hospital institutions, perhaps, there is still room for a viewpoint that shows the human limitations of people, whether they are administrators, doctors, chaplains, or patients. There is still room for someone who can stick a pin in the puffed-up self-importance of those who find some pleasure in their own misfortunes or have no concern for the very real problems of others. There is room for one who is foolish enough to believe that there are invisible matters that are more important than the visible in the midst of a "just-the-facts" culture. There is need for a clown who knows that stilted dignity is not a very viable posture for a human being—

however educated, however wealthy, however pious he might be. There is a need for one who can bring a wry smile by pointing up the limitations of our knowledge, or by referring quietly to the physical obvious fact of the inevitability of death for us all. There is a need for one who knows that all human techniques must fail because man is more complex than the most complex of them. There is need for one who knows that to be a doctor or a lawyer or a chaplain or a man of wealth or power is really nothing at all compared to the fact that all of us put our trousers on one leg at a time. (These days of feminine lib, combined with the styles of today, make that comment rather inclusive.)

It is the jester who has a chance of correcting us all when our stated values and our actual behavior are so widely divergent as to be ludicrous. It is a true, important, and most needed fool who can know in the midst of his jesting that he also can be wrong. And yet it is the jester who is the true believer. If he did not believe that man could overcome hypocrisy, why would he even recognize it? If he did not know that God cares, how could he be so sensitive to the callous actions of people? If he did not believe that compassion was still possible, why would he be able to portray his own pathetic stance so vividly as to cause us to identify with him? If he did not believe in life eternal, how could he jest even in the teeth of his own death?

Robert MacAfree Brown in a recent article in the *Christian Century* comments on Christ as a clown figure.<sup>4</sup> He directs our attention to Emmett Kelly, the circus clown who so painstakingly attempted to sweep up a spot of light from the floor of the arena. We knew he couldn't do it, but we knew that what he was doing was a true picture of much of our lives. Just recently I watched a portion of the ancient Chaplin film, *The Gold Rush*. In it the little tramp, starving in a dilapidated cabin out in the wilderness, cooked for himself and a guest a Thanksgiving dinner made up of nothing but his own worn out old shoe. He cooked up the shoe and served it with a flair, as if it were the finest of turkeys or tenderest of steaks. He believed so strongly in what he was doing that his guest joined him in the feast. With a flourish the little tramp lifted up the shoelaces and twined them spaghetti-like around his fork and swallowed them with a smile of satisfaction. He even burped when he finished. He was hypnotized, perhaps, by his own fantasy—or given over completely to the art of living with the facts of life. When we have nothing else, perhaps it really isn't so foolish to learn how to be satisfied with very little. To know we are going to die is not so bad if we savor the life we now have and enjoy it to the end, only to find out then that it was no more than a shoe for a banquet, or rather, that although the feast featured in materialistic terms only a shoe, the feast was nonetheless a feast.

Maybe you are content to go on being a prophet, or a priest, or a "jerk." I hope for more, myself. Perhaps I am still trying to sweep up that spot of light or make a feast out of an old shoe, but I refuse to race into the

<sup>4</sup>"From Clown to Fish," Feb. 23, 1972, p. 222.

realm of the prophet and the priest, and I certainly want to break out of the puppet show, even if the freedom I find is only the freedom to go on being foolish. (Paul had some words to say about that.) If to be serious means to accept the structure of things as they are, (the hospital, the penitentiary, the Army, the Congress, our total society) then I prefer to be silly. I cannot hide either in the culture or in the *cultus*. I must be who I am, even if I realize how foolish and how futile that statement is as I make it.

It intrigues me to note with Robert MacAfee Brown the likeness between the Rouault clown-face and the Rouault Christ-face. It encourages me when I am told that through the centuries one of the symbols of Christ has been that of God's fool. Christ, the cosmic, rather than comic, clown whose life ended in victory over death, was the one man who really had a grip on reality. His reality was so different from that which this world accepts as reality that it is often seen as ludicrous. Philosophers continue to rediscover the foolishness of the faith.

Lest you stick a pin in my balloon, I hasten to do it myself by pointing out that I know I am a fool when I proclaim my goal to be similar to the goal of Jesus. If it is, I am in good company; if it is not, then that is my fault and now His. Perhaps I'll fall on my "prat." But if I do, he'll not only laugh with me, he'll lift me up. Help me find the title less offensive than that of *jestor* that yet includes the best of that term and I'll thank you for it. Personally I had rather be a jester than a jerk, or a prophet, or a priest...or a chaplain. How about you? I close with these words from Harvey Cox in his book, *The Feast of Fools*:<sup>5</sup>

Only by learning to laugh at the hopelessness around us can we touch the hem of hope, Christ the clown signifies our playful appreciation of the past and our comic refusal to accept the spectre of inevitability in the future. He is the incarnation of festivity and fantasy.

All I can say is, "On with the dance."

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 142.

## I Am The Chaplaincy

**Chaplain (LTC) Robert L. Gushwa**

I am the Chaplaincy. For more than two centuries I have ministered in the name of God to the armed forces of the Nation. I was born on 29 July 1775 by act of Congress. The Word of God and the Declaration of Independence are my birth certificate. Blood lines of the world run in my veins, for I offer freedom to the oppressed.

I was there from the beginning. I am William Emerson and Joseph Thaxter at Concord Bridge. I am John Martin at Bunker Hill preaching, "Be ye not afraid of them." I am John Rosbrugh, killed by enemy bayonet or sword, while kneeling in prayer for family and enemies. I am Samuel Kirkland ministering for thirty years to the Oneida Indians, and the Tuscaroras, who remained on the side of an emerging nation. I am George Duffield who helped prohibit slavery in the Northwest Territory. I am Israel Evans building the first Army chapel, "The Temple" at Newburgh.

I was there meeting the enemy face to face, will to will. I ministered to the men whose bleeding feet stained the snow at Valley Forge; my frozen hands pulled Washington across the Delaware. At Yorktown the sunlight glinted from the sword and I, begrimed the battered, saw a nation born. I am young men serving as chaplains and doubling as surgeons and unit commanders, and I am a sturdy patriot who volunteered at 73 years of age to bring the Word and Sacraments to the troops. I sacrificed for the new nation: health, homes, and possessions were lost, one of my number lost three sons, another two; ten chaplains were captured, three were killed, two wounded in battle, and eight died of other causes.

Hardship and glory I have known. I am Learner Blackman at New Orleans, with those who fought beyond the hostile hour and showed the fury of their long rifles. I visited the sick and wounded, heard their confessions, prayed with them in their fears. I am the Chaplaincy.

I am Adam Empie, chaplain at West Point, "a spot formed by nature to be the nursery of heroes."

Westward I pushed the wagon trains, moved with an empire across the plains. I am Abel Barber at Fort Winnebago teaching Bible study, beginning a temperance society, establishing prayer groups, and resigning rather than conduct separate worship services for officers and enlisted men. I am Jeremiah Porter breaking the ice in the St. Mary's River

at Fort Brady to baptize two soldiers and an Indian woman. I am Richard Cadle organizing a school for Indian children in 1837 at Fort Crawford.

I was with Scott at Verz Cruz, hunted the guerilla in the mountain passes, and scaled the high plateau. The fighting was done when I ended my march many miles from the old Alamo.

From Bull Run to Appomattox, I fought and bled and died. Both Blue and Grey were my colors then. Three million Americans came under my influence during four tragic years of civil strife.

I am Milton L. Haney winning the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry near Atlanta. I am five chaplains who were promoted to general officer rank for outstanding service. I am Michael M. Allen, a Jewish soldier elected from the ranks to be a regimental chaplain. I am Father Paul Gillen whose horse and carriage were called "a Plimpton bedstead, a cathedral, and a restaurant all combined." I am A.S. Fiske performing a marriage ceremony at which 119 couples freed from slavery were joined within an hour. I am Chaplain Quintard converting General Bragg, who with tears in his eyes said he'd waited for twenty years for someone to speak to him that way. I am Benjamin Trumbull telling the men that the colonel had detailed him to do all the necessary swearing for the unit and to send for him if some had to be done.

I was there when the Rough Riders charged up San Juan Hill. I am Orville Nave and his wife and daughter running a special diet kitchen for four hospitals full of the sick and wounded from Cuba. I am William D. McKinnon, though painfully wounded, negotiating with the archbishop and the Spanish chief of staff for the surrender of Manila to avoid further bloodshed.

Freedom called and I answered, and stayed 'til it was "over, over there." At Chateau-Thierry, over the top, with the "Doughboys" at the rock of the Marne; it was I who saw the Hindenburg line crack. The Argonne, Verdun; these are the things that I am, the memories still live. I left my heroic dead in Flanders Field where poppies blow. I am George McCarthy riding a French horse through artillery fire to say mass. I am Francis Duffy of New York's fighting 69th who made the ecumenical movement a reality in rain sodden trenches. I am the Chief of Chaplains leading prayers at the burial of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington.

A generation older, at Bataan, I briefly bowed as a fellow prisoner with "GI Joes," and prayed for deliverence. I am Alfred C. Oliver, who lost 100 pounds, was three times beaten into unconsciousness by the Japanese, and suffered a neck broken with a rifle butt blow. But I grew to 9,000 strong. I am the Four Immortal Chaplains on the Dorchester, one Jewish, one Catholic, and two Protestants, who gave away life belts to other men, and with arms locked went to death in the sea, but gave an example of brotherhood and sacrifice that shall never die. I am Francis Sampson staying behind with the wounded to face certain capture. I am James H. O'Neill praying for "fair weather for battle" for Patton's tankers. Normandy, St. Lo, the Bulge, Bouganville, and islands "where uncommon

valor was a common virtue" become a part of my heritage. I am Abraham Feffer, a 17 year old Jewish survivor of Dachau, who ten years after his rescue joined my ranks "to repay a debt for my life."

With the bugle's mournful "taps" just fading from my ears and heart, a new danger called me back to war. In Korea I gathered my strength around Pusan, swept across the frozen Han, outflanked the Red's at Inchon and marched to the Yalu. All too soon ended garrison duty and parish-like ministries; needed now was the flexibility to minister to front line troops in combat, to refugees, prisoners, the sick, wounded and dying, to sagging moral, and military stalemate. I am Hudson, Gilman and Hyatt. I am Arthur C. Mills getting a second Silver Star for rescuing the wounded under fire. I am Holland Hope winning an award unprecedented for a chaplain, the Combat Infantry Badge, for leading a force to rescue the wounded. I am Emil J. Kapaun, stealing food from the enemy to feed fellow prisoners, washing the underwear of those sick with dysentery, and dying among them. I am Kenneth C. Hyslop who died of mistreatment and starvation.

"The longest War" began and I returned to the jungle, this time in Viet Nam. Months of boredom punctuated by moments of stark terror; fire bases, LZ's, the flapping whir of helicopter rotors, heat and rain and bugs and smells, R&R, and flag draped coffins at Ton Son Nhut; Hue, and Phu Loi, "Nuc Mam" and "Xin Loi" become part of my long life. I am Meir Engel, the first chaplain to die in Viet Nam. And I am Charles J. Watters and Angelo J. Liteky, the only Army chaplains since the Civil War to receive the Medal of Honor. I am Carl C. Creswell reporting My Lai. I am Emil F. Kapusta, the last chaplain to leave Viet Nam.

I know you will understand if I avoid the use of words like gallantry or valor or glory. I will leave them to those who have not had to add up the ledger of violence and misery. My own heart is too full of losses. The chaplaincy was behind only the Infantry and the Air Corps in proportionate combat deaths in World War II. Ministering in war is a long, lonely, dirty job, and there is nothing glorious about killing one's fellow man, or being killed by him, or passing many, many days in hatred and misery fear. We like to say that war is cruel, but no one knows how cruel it is—how deeply, monstrously cruel—unless he has himself walked through the fire and felt it sear him. Let us remember then, they would want us to remember—if only because it may cause us to strengthen our resolve not to sow the dragon's teeth again.

The trumpet of the Lord shall never sound retreat and the challenges are ever present. Drug problems, alcoholism, racial confrontations, sexism, loneliness, education, marriage counseling, evangelism, stewardship, mission, seders and sacraments, changing morals, social upheaval, a volunteer Army...these are my ministry. I am the Chaplaincy.

From Concord Bridge to Heartbreak Ridge, from the Arctic to the Mekong, the National Guard and the Reserves from a hundred small towns...I am the Chaplaincy...always ready...then, now, and forever. I

was conceived in freedom and God willing in freedom will spend the rest of my days.

May I possess always the integrity, the courage, and the strength to keep myself unshackled, to remain a citadel of freedom and a beacon of strength to the world.

This is my wish, my goal, my prayer—208 years after my birth. I am the Chaplaincy.

---

## BOOK REVIEWS

---

### *Sacraments as God's Self Giving: Sacramental Practice and Faith*

James F. White

Abingdon Press, Nashville, TN 1983

158 pp. \$8.95 Paperback

James F. White taught at the Perkins School of Theology for twenty-two years and is now professor of liturgy at the University of Notre Dame. He has served as president of the North American Academy of liturgy and received its Berakah Award. He also chaired the editorial committee of the Section on Worship of the Board of Discipleship of the United Methodist Church. He holds an A.B. from Harvard, a B.D. from Union Theological Seminary (New York), and a Ph.D. from Duke University. He has studied at Yale University, Cambridge University in England, and the Pontifical Institute in Rome. He is the author of numerous books and articles on worship.

Much modern liturgical scholarship eschews the centuries-old theological method of deriving systematic theologies from the dogmatics of the various traditions. Today's approach looks at the liturgy for insights about the meaning of the sacraments, for instance, and the extent to which such insights help broaden sacramental understanding. The analysis presented in this book is an excellent example of the current approach.

Following a thematic motif throughout, namely that "God's self giving is the basis of the Christian sacraments," the study takes a comprehensive look at sacramental practice in contemporary Christian traditions. Baptism and the Eucharist are examined, as are several additional actions and rites. The author suggests adoption of several levels of authority for sacraments and offers three possible categories: *dominical* (Baptism and Eucharist); *apostolic* (apostolic practice bent on fulfilling the intention of Jesus); *natural* (Christian marriage and burial). He provides ample support for this approach.

Dr. White uses the concept of "the liturgical circle" as his organizational principle, that is, movement from practice to theology and back to practice. Having surveyed and analyzed current practice, he turns to some theological reflection about the faith expressed in what is said and done

sacramentally in worship. The circle is then completed as he uses such reflection as a basis for suggested reforms to increase the effectiveness of sacramental faith expression.

The author asserts that his suggestions have particular relevance for churches "in the center of the liturgical spectrum of American Protestantism (Reformed, Methodist, and portions of the Free Church traditions)." But the focus is not all that narrow and other Christian traditions will certainly find the ideas and concepts useful and interesting. To demonstrate the point, the final chapter is "A Roman Catholic Response," by Edward J. Kilmartin, S.J. director of the graduate program in liturgical studies at the University of Notre Dame. A bibliography, separated under specific chapter titles, and an index complete the volume.

This is a positive, reasonable presentation of modern provocative Christian thinking about the sacraments in the context of the evolutionary Church.

—William E. Paul, Jr.

### *A Letter of Consolation*

Henri Nouwen

San Francisco: Harper and Row, Publishers

This little book—96 pages in length—was originally written by Henri Nouwen as a letter of consolation six months after the death of his mother. As he states in the introduction his original intent was that this was to be a personal letter for only his father. What Henri Nouwen has shared with us is his own personal struggle over the death of his mother so that all, "who suffer the pain death can bring and who search for new life" can benefit from his own search for consolation within the context of his own faith. The unique context of this letter is that it is written over a 10 day period beginning with Holy Week and concluding on the Tuesday following Easter. It is within the context of his reflection on the Passion of Christ, and the resurrection that the real contribution of this book is made.

The attraction and intensity of this book comes from the fact that it is a very personal account that reflects on the meaning of his mother's death and her life on his life and that of his father. Nouwen affirms that through his mother's experience that every experience must become a new experience: not only "new", but a painful experience, because each experience is filled with rememberances that make these special times "first times" that are filled with pain for the family. As he shares his grief with his father he also brings to a light a very important point for all those who mourn one who loved deeply and who was loved deeply in return. He tells his father that the grief will never go away, because "it would be diminishing the importance of his mother's life, underestimating the depth of your grief and the power of the love that bound you together for forty-seven

years." If this book had no other value than to remind mourners and comforters of this point this book would be worth reading and rereading. Consolation comes not from the removal of the grief, but from the reaffirmation of the life of the deceased on each event and person in the family.

The second value of this book is that Nouwen would have us look at the positive value of death. This means that death simplifies matters that either seemed very complicated or very undefined. To put it another way, death lays bare what really matters, and in this way becomes your judge. The death of his mother helped him to see that life is a process of mortification. This leads him to make a call for us to see that life means dependence on God.

The final uniqueness of the book is found in the time of writing; Holy Week. All of Nouwen's reflection on the death of his mother are mixed with the meaning of the death and resurrection of Christ. Just as the death of Christ was for others; the meaning of the death of a loved one is found out in the lives of those loved. The resurrection is the triumph over death for Nouwen in the human sphere as well, because it is the triumph of love over death. The peace that he gains in his mother's death is that triumph of the love of God over death for his mother, his father and himself.

—Chaplain (CPT) Robert A. Wildeman

### *Contemporary Approaches to Christian Education*

Jack L. Seymour and Donald E. Miller  
with Sara P. Little, Charles R. Foster, Allen J. Moore, and Carol A. Wehrheim

Nashville: Abingdon, 1982  
175 pages, \$5.96 paperback

Jack L. Seymour is assistant professor of Christian education at Scarritt College, Nashville, TN. He is a graduate of Vanderbilt University.

Donald E. Miller is professor of Christian education and the director of graduate studies at Bethany Theological Seminary, Oak Brook, Illinois. He received his PhD from Harvard University.

Stimulating and exciting—these two words describe this book for me! It is stimulating because it is contemporary. It is exciting because it is future-looking.

The points of view of Christian educators who are shaping what is happening in this arena today are described. Five contemporary approaches to Christian education explore the aim and purpose, the role of the teacher, the nature of the learner, and the context within which Christian education occurs. These five approaches are: religious instruc-

tion, faith community, spiritual development, liberation, and interpretation. The metaphors used by these approaches are education, community of faith, person, justice, and meaning.

Daring to dream about the future with its questions and its resources, five exciting directions are offered as stimuli for shaping Christian education. These are:

1. Christian education must seek to recover its historic commitment to social transformation.
2. Christian educators must continue to define Christian education as a central yet distinct ministry of the church.
3. The relationship of developmental psychological theory to Christian education must be reconsidered.
4. Christian educators must seek to clarify the relationship of Christian education to the wider learning environment.
5. The foundational relationship of Christian education to both educational theory and theology must be explored continually.

Present practice is set in tension with the contemporary challenge of moving into the future.

—Chaplain, Lt Col, Lewis E. Dawson

### *The Challenge of Marxist and Neo-Marxist Ideologies for Christian Scholarship*

John Vander Stelt, editor

Sioux Center, Iowa: Dordt Press  
280 pages, \$12.50, paper

This volume consists of eleven papers read to the Third International Conference of Institutions for Christian Higher Education in August of 1981. This ICICHE was held at Dordt College. There were 130 delegates, observers, and visitors from 65 educational institutions and associations representing some nineteen countries and all continents.

These scholars, while radically critical of Marxism, know how to take Marxism seriously and thus these papers can provide chaplains with the sort of primary analysis needed to understand *that Marxism is a logical development of consistent Renaissance theoretics.* (P.246.)

Some of the chapters treat Poland: "Human Freedom and Social Justice"; Latin America: "Liberation Theology"; the U.S.A.'s black population: "Liberation Theology"; China: "The Place of Religion and Education"; and "Marism and Education: A Survey Report."

The latter particularly is valuable for its references to contemporary development of educational philosophy in the German Democratic Republic by Marxists theoretician Gerhard Neuner. Marxists view our Western educational philosophy as "irresponsible" (p. 220) because we (allegedly) teach in a rather objective fashion, NOT seeking to mold character and ethics of the students. Neuner *et. al.* make this criticism

because Marxist education is eschatological *to its core*: the future success depends on development of “the new man” NOW and this new man must not only be mentally, physically, and skilfully prepared, he/she must possess the correct spiritual or moral character—the latter being provided by the communist party’s SPIRIT or ideology.

For Marxists there can be no *real* revolution without an educational revolution based upon “the actual goal of human history” (p. 218), which goal of all human history is communism itself—the perfect classless society. Every person of a state is an object of this educational process and his/her qualities are to be as follows:

the basic tenets of Communism, the principles of a highly cultivated, honest, progressive person: Love for one’s socialist fatherland, friendship, comradeship, humaneness, honest love for socialist work and a whole number of other attributes which everybody can understand. The augmentation and promotion of these noble qualities therefore also forms the main part of Communist education.

This book is a painstaking contribution to our understanding of what is largely *terra incognita* among Chaplains and the military and congregants in general. This “unknown ground”, if investigated, will enable us to realize the *tensions* between the antithetical poles in Marxism: between the INDIVIDUAL over against the COLLECTIVE and how education is centered on the one OR the other, depending upon the communist party’s SPIRIT at the time.

Some writers have pointed out that Marxism is a distorted image of Christian thought. For example, the creator God is now HUMAN CREATIVITY; the Holy Spirit is the COMMUNIST PARTY SPIRIT (or ideology); the Word from (or *of*) God is the GOALS OF HUMAN WILLING; and so on. What is not sufficiently pointed out, in my opinion, is that Marxist thought is a consistent working out of the spirit of what Bernard Zylstra calls the “immanentization motif of the Renaissance” (p., 246). That impressive phrase means that the “Renaissance project” enunciated by northern Italy’s Pico della Mirandola in the 1480s rejected a *real* God and, in its (His?) place substituted an autonomous, self-governing humankind.

A brief quotation from Marx’s 1844 “Private Property and Communism” clarifies this immanentization, Renaissance project concept:

*A being* only considers himself independent when he stands on his own feet; and he only stands on his own feet when he owes his *existence* to himself. a man who lives by the grade of another regard himself as a dependent being... The *Creation* is therefore an idea very difficult to dislodge from popular consciousness.

From Marx the “Healer” or “Savior”, if you will, that brings together the

opposing poles of man and nature is none other than labor itself. As such, Marxism has no need to belabor the concept of atheism because the *existence* of man is a sufficient postulate to make it unnecessary to go on denying the existence of a deity. (Pages 247-8.)

—Chaplain (CPT) Robert H. Countess

### *Education for Peace and Justice*

Edited by Padraic O'Hare

Harper & Row, Publishers, San Francisco, CA 1983  
256 pp. \$9.95 Paperback

Padraic O'Hare is Associate Director of the Institute of Religious Education and Pastoral Ministry at Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts; he is also Adjunct Associate Professor of Theology and Religious Education at the same college. Dr. O'Hare has some twenty years of religious education experience, ranging from elementary schools up through graduate ministerial education. He is author of numerous published articles and editor of two previous collections on religious education.

Peace and justice are social issues as old as the human race. They are key words in the religious vocabularies of Judaism and Christianity. They are also learned concepts that must be taught to each new generation and kept current on a lifelong continuing basis. This collection of specifically commissioned scholarly essays is a very helpful contribution toward deepened and expanded insights for those involved in such educational corporate human action.

The material in this book is presented systematically in three distinct parts. Four writers deal first with certain foundational matters related to the teaching and practice of social justice; eight others are concerned with different dimensions of educational issues germane to the subject; four consider some specific related ministerial issues. Each essay concludes in good pedagogical order with a set of suggested questions for reflection and discussion.

The writers are all Catholic men and women from various ethnic and national backgrounds who share a commitment to Catholic social doctrine. All sixteen are also persons of obvious sensitivity to ecumenical concerns, which enhances the appeal and value of what they write for a wider range of readers. A partial list of contributors reflects the degree of excellence and expertise demonstrated by all of the writers: Thomas Groome, Mary Boys, David Hollenbach, Claire Lowery, Gabriel Moran, Margaret Gorman, Virgil Elizondo, Ada Maria Isasi-Diaz.

Taken together, all of the essayists in this volume offer firm theological, biblical, and spiritual outlines and guidance for a dynamic Christian social mission, including religious education dimensions and pastoral concerns.

—William E. Paul, Jr.

## *Soul Friend*

Kenneth Leech

San Francisco: Harper and Row, Publishers

Kenneth Leech is an Anglican priest who has provided a rich resource for renewed thinking in the area of "Spirituality". He has done this by providing concise histories of our spiritual heritage, and the psychological movement that formed the basis for our Western culture. At the same time by beginning his book with an analysis of the present climate of fascination with the Eastern philosophies, he sets forth his case that what is needed and relevant today is a Christian spirituality that goes beyond form to spirit; and that has as its methodology "spiritual directors" to guide people into the reality of a living faith.

Leech's first principal is that there must be a removal in a spirituality that is a mixture of aesthetic and classical theology. His intent is to move those who are in places of leadership to make theology not just a matter of principals or right teachings; but to bring those right teachings in touch with the soul. His concern is to return our thinking to the teaching and proper use of the reality of meditation, contemplation and prayer so that the life of the parishoner attuned to God. His concern is that we concentrate not just on right teachings and actions, but also on a right spirit.

If there is to be a renewal in "spirituality" there must be a regeneration on the part of the clergy that tis is their call and mission. He describes this function as that of a "spiritual director." The purpose of the spiritual director is to guide people along the road to God. The concern of the director is to be the whole person. At this point Leech involves his readers in two related areas of thought. The first is that clergy has given away much of the rightful place to psychologists and therapists in the area of counseling. He maintains that true spiritual direction will make the director essential to the wholeness of the person no matter what the disorder might be. He also lays the charge at the feet of the clergy that we have deserted our parishoners in their search for meaning in all the transitions of life. He consistently argues that rather than enemies the spiritual, psychological and physical should be working together for the wholeness of the person. Indeed, he argues that the pastor/priest is the best suited one for this process. At the basis of his argument is that we are uniquely spiritual beings.

The greatest contribution of the author is bringing the reader back in touch with the great heritage/traditions of spirituality dating back to the Desert Fathers through the modern age. To read the brief passages from the church fathers and others is invigorating and motivating. Additionally, he concludes the book with a section on prayer and the sacraments as a means of growth that deserves thought.

This is a thought provoking, eye opening, practical book on a subject that is much neglected, or abdicated by the church in our time. It is

worthy to be read on its own merits, and as a resource to other material in the area of spiritual growth and direction.

— — Chaplain (CPT) Robert A. Wildeman

***The Ethnic Myth:  
Race Ethnicity, and Class in America***

Stephen Steinberg

Boston: Beacon Press, 1982  
278 pages, \$10.95 paperback

This sociologist challenges the present trends toward "ethnic awareness." On the contrary, he contends that some of the so-called "ethnic traits" are not *ethnic* at all, but they are rather the traits of *class*, *locale* or *social conditions*.

If his inferences are in fact correctly drawn from the historical-statistical data he has studied, then we shall have to change radically or superficial generalities about the successes and the failures of America's immigrants. (We should remember that *all* are immigrants, even the Native Americans who are the result of an incursion at some ancient time.)

Steinberg begins: "The late 1960s witnessed an outbreak of what might be called 'ethnic fever.' One after another, the nation's racial and ethnic minorities sought to rediscover their waning ethnicity and to reaffirm their ties to the cultural past." This fever began among blacks and eventually spread to Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Asians, Native Americans and, finally, to Jews, Irish, Poles, Italians and other Europeans. *Assimilation* became for some a dirty word as they chose to assert their ethnic individualism and pride. (P. 3.)

In Part One, "The Simmering Melting Pot," readers will specifically be interested in the debate about America as the melting pot and over against those who advocate "ethnic pluralism"—the latter meaning that ethnic groups are unmeltable.

Part Two, "The Social Class and Ethnic Myths," is the heart of the book, particularly the two chapters entitled "Education and Ethnic Mobility: The Myth of Jewish Intellectualism" and "Why Irish Became Domes-tics and Italians and Jews Did Not."

The third part, "The Class Character of Racial and Ethnic Conflict," seeks to demonstrate that *class* differences—NOT racial or ethnic differences—are the key to understanding and resolving conflicts. Of signal interest is Chapter 9, "The 'Jewish Problem' in America Higher Education."

Steinberg concludes that the melting pot concept is anti-democratic and repressive because it seeks the "deracination of immigrant culture." On the other hand, he criticizes *pluralist principles* for being "built upon systematic inequalities that constituted an untenable basis for long-term

ethnic preservation." (P. 254.) "Who am I?" is the big ethnic question (as well as the biggest of existential questions). And attendant to that question is another: "Into what do I assimilate?" If the pot is unclear, it is understandable that people will cling to an ethnic past with its ritual of *belonging*.

The ultimate ethnic myth is that "cultural ethnic symbols of the past" can *really* provide a sturdy shield against present discontent among ethnic groups. I agree.

Readers will perhaps want to compare and contrast this book with the more powerful works of Thomas Sowell on this subject—*Ethnic America* (Basic Books, 1981) and *Race and Economics* (Longman Inc., 1975) and *Black Education: Myths and Tragedies* (David McKay Co., 1972). Another, but much more dated work to compare, is Nathaniel Weyl's *The Geography of Intellect* (Henry Regnery Co., 1963) in which he suggests that priestly celibacy is directly relevant (neglective) to the relatively poor record of Roman Catholics among intellectuals. Weyl attributes celibacy to a significant lessening of a learned gene pool among this population group; he also notes that the traditionally larger families work against intellectual accomplishments.

Steinberg flip flops—as do many writers and speakers—inconsistently between employing the term "Jew" on the one hand as a religious term (its more accurate meaning) and on the other hand as an ethnic term (its more confusing use). Likewise, he confuses "anti-Semitism" with "anti-Jewishness," a confusion that he shares with most moderns, but a confusion that is totally unnecessary and unjustifiable among highly educated writers and speakers.

—Chaplain (CPT) Robert H. Countess

### *Care of Mind/Care of Spirit: Psychiatric Dimensions of Spiritual Direction*

Gerald G. May, M.D.

Harper & Row, Publishers, San Francisco, CA 1982  
128 pp. \$11.95 Hardback

### *Will and Spirit: a Contemplative Psychology*

Gerald G. May, M.D.

Harper & Row, Publishers, San Francisco, CA 1982  
360 pp. \$24.95 Hardback

Gerald G. May, M.D., is a psychiatrist with a private practice in Columbia, Maryland. He has taught on the clinical medical faculties of Pennsylvania State University, Temple University, and the University of Maryland. He has served on the clinical staffs of Patuxent Institution and Spring Grove Hospital Center in Maryland. Dr. May also serves on the faculty of the training program in spiritual direction co-sponsored by the Washington Theological Union and the Shalem Institute for Spiritual Formation in Washington, D.C. His earlier published

books are *Simply Sane*, *The Open Way*, and *Pilgrimage Home*.

Spiritual direction and psychiatry are both growth activities in our time. Increasing numbers of persons seem to be looking for spiritual guides or helpers capable of assisting them with personal direction, increased religious understanding, and the experience of a sense of fulfillment. Similarly, more and more look to psychiatry and related fields for helpful guidance through the complex and difficult prospects and problems of life toward some inner sense of calmness and well-being. Both of these fine books seek to initiate a movement toward better relations between psychiatry and spiritual direction as disciplines.

*Care of Mind/Care of Spirit* offers some cautionary guidance regarding the boundaries that exist between the two disciplines; also, some invaluable and informed guidance for walking what is described as "their rugged interfaces."

In the relatively brief compass of eight tightly written chapters there are discussed certain historical matters regarding spiritual direction; the implications of the relation of consciousness to spirit and soul, together with some experiential spiritual categories; some human responses to more profound spiritual experiences; the dynamics of the relationship between spiritual director and directee; personality theory and severe personality styles, or psychiatric syndromes; and the matter of psychiatric referral as well as collaborative efforts between spiritual director and psychiatrist. A select, annotated bibliography provides fertile areas for further study.

The book is a very current, scholarly, well written manual for counselors and spiritual directors who inevitably must deal with various psychiatric considerations. Its value is strongly enhanced by the author's manifest spiritual depth and insights.

*Will and Spirit* is Dr. May's fifth published book. It is a fitting corollary to *Care of Mind/Care of Spirit*. In this latest study he attempts—very successfully—a description of what he terms "the reconciliation of will and spirit," which he believes to be essential for human survival and wellbeing. Within this description he offers an incipient "contemplative psychology" concerned with enlightening and deepening current psychological understandings with some distilled insights from contemplatives of the past. This is *not*, he emphasizes, another try at explaining spiritual experience using psychological terminology. Indeed, this book also constitutes the author's beginning statement of his personal faith, which is affirmed as being Christian.

The text contains masterful discussions of the relationships between will and spirit; the meanings of germane concepts and terminology; the keystone nature of "unitive experience"; human spiritual longing and searching; human fear for spiritual self-surrender; "maturation in loving"; "Energy: The Unifying Force"; management of emotions and "attachment"; sin and evil. The final chapter, "On Being a Pilgrim and a Helper," addresses what is really involved in willingness toward God, or

spiritual surrender, and what criteria apply for ascertaining its legitimacy. It also considers spiritual practice of "this right relationship to the Power and Love of God," opening the self to unearned (graced) realizations stemming from a profound and frequent remembrance of existence as God's children in the environment of divine love.

Dr. May's erudition, writing skills, and above all his spiritual orientation make this a challenging and provocative study for those who experience spiritual longing and continue to search for genuine spiritual experiences. It is at the same time an invaluable guide for spiritual directors and those who aspire to become directors as they practice and work toward that calling.

—William E. Paul, Jr.

***The Greek New Testament  
According to the Majority Text***

Zane C. Hodges and Arthur L. Farstad

Thomas Nelson, Publishers, 1982  
810 pages, \$13.95 hardcover

The available manuscript witnesses to the NT text number in excess of 5,000 and *very* few of these have the entire NT in them. Yet these witnesses are more numerous than for any other ancient work.

Since the manuscripts exhibit various traditions as to what the original text might have been, a scientific discipline has come about which attempts to establish that original text, and that discipline is called "Textual Criticism." This effort requires enormous work and dedication. While it is *theoretically* possible to recover the autographa (= original texts), it is *in fact* a 100% unattainable goal, especially since the text experts all agree that the originals long ago perished (probably within years or decades of their being penned).

While a scientific discipline, text criticism unfortunately allows for subjective judgments by practitioners who must determine which to select among competing variant readings. This subjective weakness is further enhanced by the presuppositions which the practitioners hold with reference to the text itself: e.g., should the text be regarded as any other piece of literature? or should *this* text be a *special case* because of its inspired and/or inerrant provenance?

Hodges and Farstad certainly belong to the latter group—the minority group, to be sure, within text critical circles. These two scholars have brought forth their book amid great scholarly controversy, especially since most scholars disagree with their fundamental theory: that the majority of manuscripts represents to original text. For more than two hundred years now, scholars have followed a different theory: that manuscripts are to be WEIGHED rather than COUNTED.

The Authorized Version (1611), popularly called the King James version, largely represents this "majority text," which is comprised largely of relatively late dated manuscript witnesses. The most popular Greek text of our day is that of Westcott and Hort (about 1881) and it relied heavily upon fourth century uncial codices prepared from this text traditions dominant in Egypt. Westcott and Hort referred to this text as the "Neutral Text."

For chaplains who avail themselves of their Greek studies, this volume can be of significance also inasmuch as it provides a critical Greek NT text with a running *criticus apparatus* with rather complete manuscript citations. One can compare these with one's Nestle text or that of the United Bible Societies.

The text format is laid out in paragraphs with English topical headings interspersed; the typeface is quite clear and the overall quality of materials is good. Perhaps this volume will incite some preachers to perform some distant New Year's resolution "to get back into my Greek New Testament." I certainly hope so.

— — Chaplain (CPT) Robert H. Countess

### ***The Authoritative Word: Essays on the Nature of Scripture***

Edited by Donald K. McKim

William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI 1983  
270 pp. \$10.95 Paperback

Donald K. McKim is Assistant Professor of Theology at the University of Dubuque Theological Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa. He is the author of *The Church: Its Early Life* and co-author (with Jack B. Rogers) of *The Authority and Inspiration of the Bible: An Historical Approach*.

The accelerated flow of new and more accurate knowledge about the Bible in recent years and resultant controversies over its inspiration and authority tend to confuse many Christian believers. There are so many specialized studies that the serious reader finds it ever more difficult to take advantage of the improved understanding that each may contribute. This volume is intended to help reduce the confusion and difficulty.

Donald McKim offers an anthology of what he describes as "some of the best theological thought [regarding] the nature and formation of the Scriptures." The essays are chapters and articles from previous publications; while the sources and perspectives vary, all thirteen are principally concerned with biblical authority and the bible as the Word of God. Collectively, they provide an overview of biblical formation, the development of the canon, historical treatment, and interpretation.

The selections are grouped in three principal categories. The first considers scriptural authority as related to sources and canon; the second focuses on the doctrine of scriptural authority and its development; the

third provides a survey of current views. There is a comprehensive bibliography (annotated) to assist readers who wish to investigate the overall subject further. The writers include such widely known scholars as James D. Smart, Avery Dulles, C.K. Barrett, Paul J. Achtemeier, F.F. Bruce, Robert M. Grant, C.C. Berkouwer, and Donald G. Bloesch.

This is indeed a very useful and dependable presentation of a moderate position in the ongoing debate about biblical authority. It would be a valuable addition to the chapel library for the chaplain and for religious education leaders.

— William E. Paul, Jr.

### *Christian Tolerance: Paul's Message to the Modern Church*

Robert Jewett

The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, PA 1982  
168 pp. \$9.95 Paperback

Robert Jewett is Professor of New Testament Interpretation at Garrett Evangelical Theological Seminary, Evanston, Illinois. He is author of *Jesus Against the Rapture: Seven Unexpected Prophecies*.

The theory and practice of tolerance are both undergoing considerable stress and strain, inside and outside the Christian church, as the problems of pluralism confront American society. A theological approach to religious pluralism, among other aspects of the problems, has become a critical need and is only now evolving. Dr. Jewett's book, part of Westminster's *Biblical Perspectives on Current Issues* series, is a notable contribution to this development.

One impediment to such a study is a widely held attitude that the Bible itself is a prime source of intolerance and that Paul's influence was a major factor in its presence among early Christians. Jewett acknowledges the existence of intolerant attitudes and actions in the biblical records; however, he affirms a need for radical revision regarding the idea of Pauline intolerance, considering recent biblical research and study. He finds Paul to be "an advocate of an active form of tolerance," which is systematically presented in the letter to the Romans, specifically in 14:1 through 15:13. In Jewett's view, these passages present the single most significant Pauline "argument in favor of tolerance that was available in the entirety of Scripture . . .," but they became casualties of various struggles within Christendom and finally lost relevance to those who sought New Testament support for advocacy of tolerance.

The five chapters of this important study provide hermeneutical bases for the author's position. They also show how Paul's ethic of mutual tolerance relates to "the problems of conscience, mission, congregational relations, and the setting of limits" in today's churches. Overall, the study

emphasizes Dr. Jewett's conviction that the Pauline approach presented in the letter to the Romans "offers a decisive resource for reformulating a doctrine of tolerance on specifically Christian grounds."

— William E. Paul, Jr.

**Change of Address**

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Old Address \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Send to:*      *Military Chaplain's Review*

U.S. Army Chaplain Board  
Myer Hall, Bldg. 1207  
Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703

JOHN A. WICKHAM, JR.

*General, United States Army*

*Chief of Staff*

*Official:*

R.M. JOYCE

*Major General, United States Army*  
*The Adjutant General*

Distribution:

Special

















